THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY studies in Christian Ethics have appeared in recent years, but the movements and events of our time call for a continual revision of the treatment of this subject. Indeed it appears to be the most vital subject in theology at the present time. Accordingly, we welcome the appearance, under the name of Andrew R. OSBORN, New York, of a solid, meritorious, and up-to-date volume entitled *Christian Ethics* (Milford; 15s. net). The book is worthy of a place among authoritative text-books, and gains from the writer's experience both in the classroom and in the pulpit.

The standpoint, method, and aim of the writer may readily be gathered from the following statement: 'Christian Ethics believes . . . that in the lives and the teaching of the prophets of Israel, in the life and teaching of Jesus, and in the lives and teaching of His disciples there is to be found a unique and authoritative statement and exemplification of the principles underlying conduct. Its method is to use the principles discovered from these sources as standards whereby to judge and interpret the facts which it has discovered from its observation of life and its analysis of the process of history. In its inquiry into the moral phenomena of life it uses the method of strict scientific investigation, and welcomes all facts which the moral and social sciences have discovered. Only it does not limit itself to these; it brings also to its task the results of its own investigation into the eternal principles underlying human conduct as these are set forth in the Bible. Thus it provides the knowledge and the guidance which our modern world with its lapsed standards of morality needs for its spiritual recovery.'

There has been a tendency among ethical writers to minimize the subject of Christian Ethics on the ground that there is only one true ethics, and Christian Ethics is therefore a question-begging phrase. Dr. OSBORN, who is obviously aware of this tendency, turns the tables on the critics by boldly claiming that the principles of Christian Ethics are in accord with those of scientific ethics.

The first part of the work, which comprises one-third of the whole, examines the foundations of Christian Ethics, and incidentally reveals the writer as a careful and competent expositor of Biblical teaching. The second part, which reveals the writer as a thoughtful and judicious investigator of modern ethical and social problems, applies the principles of Christian Ethics to such problems as war, the State and the individual, marriage and divorce, birth control, work and leisure, capitalism, gambling, propaganda, and compromise.

It is difficult to avoid dwelling in these days on the topic of war when a treatment of it comes under review, and we should like to offer our readers some account of Dr. OSBORN'S chapter on this topic. It begins by sketching briefly the

attitude of the Old and the New Testament to the question of war, but admitting that there is no clear statement in either Testament on the ethics of war, just as there is none on the ethics of slavery. Then the attitude of Christianity in history is sketched, and the urgent need is affirmed, in view of the peace movement that followed the last war, that Christian Ethics shall re-examine the issue in the light of fundamental principles.

There are certain points on which it is not difficult for Christian Ethics to give a clear judgment. Unquestionably the Christian must be peace-minded. Unquestionably also war is brutal and inhuman. But it would also appear that any form of pacifism which merely consists of anti-war sentiment and opposition to military preparedness, is out of harmony with the dynamic spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. 'Better to resist unrighteousness by force of arms than not to resist it at all.' 'If it is clear that by an inert pacifism justice, truth, and right will be defeated, such pacifism is injurious to the moral structure of humanity.'

The Christian thinker should not regard the preservation of peace as the supreme standard of a nation's conduct. True peace is never an end in itself. It is the fruit of righteousness. Nor should the Christian thinker regard the preservation of human life as the supreme standard. If a choice must be made between surrender of principle and resistance even unto blood, it becomes the duty of the State to accept the harsh alternative and maintain the right, even at the cost of war.

While Christian Ethics must rule that the moral principles which justify the State in waging war justify the individual in responding to the call to war service, there is grave danger in applying this general position to particular cases without taking into account all the facts involved. To cite the most patent instance, it is usually conceded that those devoted to the religious life should be exempt from definite military service as soldiers. Also, conscientious objectors receive more consideration if they belong to a body such as the Quakers, who have maintained their principles for centuries.

Dr. OSBORN proceeds to define more exactly the ground on which the general will of the State in its summons to military service may be set aside or modified in its application to individual citizens. It is a difficult undertaking, and not every one will be inclined to follow him here. He makes too much, it might be said, of considerations of capacity and disposition and of allegiance to a calling or to a standard of life.

Finally, it is contended that the attitude of the Church as an organised body within the State must, like the attitude of the individual to the State in relation to war, be decided on ethical grounds. The Church cannot support war as an instrument of aggression. But if the Church is persuaded that a war is necessary in the interests of right and justice, then it can support the State wholeheartedly, always seeking however to catch in the midst of chaos a vision of the righteousness and the eternal law of God. 'When after bitter experience men have learned that righteousness is the only solid basis for human relations, the process of history will be able to record another great advance towards the consummation of the Kingdom of God.'

To aid in the elucidation of moral problems arising from the war, the Student Christian Movement Press has been issuing a series of 'War-time Discussions' which aim at presenting in brief and popular form various aspects of the question. One of the freshest and most helpful of these is *The Call of God in Time of War*, by the Rev. Geoffrey F. ALLEN (9d.).

The spectator, it has been said, sees most of the game. Here is a spectator who looks at this dreadful game from an unusual viewpoint. The writer, who is a teacher in Canton Union Theological College, had experience of a year of day and night air raids, and thereafter being evacuated he has continued his work and wrestled with the issues 'in the remote security of the mountains of West China.'

One merit of his thinking is that it is concrete and grapples with the problem at close quarters. Simply to proclaim generalities is not enough. They may claim assent in Christian quarters but they leave the central issue unanswered. 'If the war is right then the call comes to use all our energies for its support. If the war is wrong, then the call comes to use all our energies as strongly in active opposition.'

Peculiarly unsatisfactory in his opinion is the idea that the troubled Christian conscience can take refuge in the half-way house of non-combatant service. It violates Kant's great moral principle that the rule governing the action of the individual must be capable of universal application. In this case 'if active combatant service is wrong for the Christian, then it is wrong for all, and we should use all our energies in opposition to military service. If military service is right for others, then it is also right for the Christian, and he has no right to shelter himself from the greater cost which others are paying.'

It may throw light upon our problem if we consider the ethic of inter-group relationships. In the monotheism which was first preached by the Hebrew prophets and is fundamental in the Christian faith it is axiomatic that the righteous law of God is binding upon nations as well as upon individuals. No nation can claim to be a law to itself. Such claim is blasphemous and a denial of human brotherhood. In the process of human development we have reached the stage when God's righteous law is embodied, doubtless most imperfectly, in national codes of law by which the individual citizens are bound together, so that each abandons the claim to be judge in his own cause, and admits the right of an impartial system of justice to judge between him and his neighbour. It is implicit in monotheism that this system should be extended to govern international relations, so that the nations of the world should be bound together in one vast community obedient to the righteous law of God.

But we are yet very far from reaching that ideal. Our immediate problem is to find out what is the best action which a Christian can take in the midst of an imperfect world. 'Here precisely the Christian ethic for individuals may serve as our guide, for the Christian ethic is essentially an ethic for redemption and world-reform in an imperfect world. In individual relationships the Christian Gospel places at the heart the ethic of forgiveness; and we may get a clue for international relationships if we see precisely what this means.'

What is forgiveness as taught and manifested in the gospel? Are we sure that we understand it? If we conceive it as wholly consisting in softness and amiability our conception is most inadequate and unscriptural. Forgiveness, as Emil Brunner has clearly shown, has two sides. 'It is both an opposition toward evil and yet a love breaking through the opposition. It is a No and a Yes. The forgiveness of God means first the No of the wrath of God. There must be repudiation of the sin that needs forgiveness; this is involved in the very statement that there is something to be forgiven. Further, this opposition to evil must last, and make itself felt, until the evil doer is aware and recognizes that his behaviour is evil.'

Forgiveness of the evil-doer is not incompatible with stout resistance of his evil-doing. If we take away from love the capacity for sternness and even for anger, love at once degenerates into amiability. We get the weak, emaciated, ineffective, powerless thing, so fatally characteristic of much present-day Christianity, and so far removed from the mind of Christ. Is it not manifest that in the sphere of human relationships a man may be so softly kind as to become for all practical purposes a nonentity? Just as the charity which is ready to give indiscriminately to every one is sure to be abused, so that gentleness which knows not how to make a stand for right and truth is simply brushed aside in this evil world and held to be of no account. In like manner it is hopeless to expect that a nation by tamely submitting to the aggressor would thereby restrain his violence and turn him to ways of peace. The aggressor would

without doubt attribute such inactivity to lack of manhood, and would rejoice in having found so easy a prey.

There are dangers on both sides. There is the danger that in opposing the evil-doer righteous indignation against the evil may easily pass over into unholy anger. On the other side there is the danger that love may degenerate into a soft and morally flabby amiability. If on the one hand the unholy passion for revenge may parade itself as the vindication of justice, so on the other hand a morally weak and timid spirit may clothe itself with the mantle of Christian charity. If we would be true to the Christian revelation of forgiving love we must hold the balance even. 'As we must continually be ready to be used as the instruments of the grace and pity and mercy of God, so also we must be ready on rare occasions to be used as the instruments of His anger. . . . As in the heart of God, so in the heart of man, forgiveness must be waiting to break through the opposition of evil, the instant there is the first sign that evil is penitent and ready for forgiveness. Yet the fact remains that a love that is true and strong has the capacity for sternness in reserve; and that without this capacity it degenerates into a weak and soft amiability, which is very far from the real meaning of Christian redemptive love.'

In the present controversy a good deal has been made of the contrast between the spirit of the Old Testament and of the New, and it has been assumed that the Old Testament must be left out of account in a Christian argument. But the Church very decisively refused to follow Marcion in his rejection of the Old Testament. It remains an integral part of the Christian revelation, a permanent undertone in the message of the New. No doubt the New Testament resounds with the mercy and grace of God, but it never denies the wrath of God against evil and His righteous judgments upon men and nations.

There is much in the teaching of the prophets of the Old Testament which throws light upon the interpretation of history. They saw how God, the Moral Ruler of the world, used the nations as the instruments of His purpose, calling at times even nations that knew Him not to be the 'rod of His anger,' and then again, when they overstepped the line, punishing their stout heart. May we not read some such divine purpose in the dire upheavals of our own day? Indeed, if like the prophets we believe that God is the Lord of history, ought we not so to read them? May the war in China not be a judgment on the proud ignorance and corruption of that great people? 'Who shall say that there is nothing of the Spirit of God at work in the Communist revolution in Russia? . . . Who shall say that at first God may not have called Hitler to restore the fallen fortunes of Germany?' And for our own nation, what? 'We hoped in the last war that we were fighting a war to end wars, but we were terribly blind to those Gospel lessons of forgiveness which alone can bring to the world the end of war. Now we are plunged again into the sufferings of war. Who shall say that the lesson is not again true in our time, "Because ye have sinned against the Lord, and have not obeyed His voice, therefore this thing is come upon you?"'

It is a narrow, dangerous, precipice path which our nation is called to tread. If we believe that we are called to be God's instrument in the vindication of justice, we must give ourselves without restraint to this service, 'yet at each moment we must feel, in our obedience, how terrible a thing it is we are called to do. We must hope and pray that the instant of anger may be short. . . . It may be that this time we may be the instrument of the wrath of God, without saying, "By the strength of my hand I have done it," and without therefore calling down upon ourselves a further judgment from God.' But if ever we are to break the vicious circle of war and counter-war we must understand and live the paradox of forgiveness. 'We must at one and the same time allow ourselves to be the instrument of divine anger and give every energy to the service of our nation in war; and yet we must also preserve the urgent longing to become the instrument of the divine pity, and prepare and pray for the day when we may forgive and love

our enemies, and build with them the supra-national fellowship of world peace.'

The April number of *Religion in Education* contains no fewer than six articles dealing with various aspects of the educational problem at the present time. This magazine is edited, and very well edited, by Dr. Basil YEAXLEE, and it contains normally articles of great value not only for teachers but for all interested in the questions raised by the training of the young. There are few, if any, journals to rival it in its own field. In the latest number Dr. YEAXLEE has gathered a number of authoritative pronouncements which raise some fundamental problems in the all-important matter of Christian education.

We draw attention to some of the questions which are suggested by our present condition and the answers suggested or implied by the writers. Emphasis is, of course, laid on the vital importance of religious education. It was always important, but to-day it is urgently so. Our task, the editor says, is to ensure that the liberties and values for which our generation is fighting and dying are kept alive in the hearts and minds of those young people who are to carry on after. We cannot imagine what the future may hold, but we know that if a Christian England is to be born from the sufferings of the present, the gospel must be presented in all its fullness to the boys and girls of to-day, and in this evangelization the schools must play a vigorous part.

We all agree. It is certain that after the war there will be great changes in the economic and social life of our country. And the main influence that will prepare the future citizens to meet and shape such changes must be Christian education. And that means that worship, religious instruction, the general curriculum and organizations, school life and that of home, church and city, vocational and continued or higher education, and recreation, shall be of one piece, and shall be in conformity with the mind of Christ.

The difficulties in the way of this ideal are very serious. They are dealt with by Mr. M. L. JACKS and others. For one thing, evacuation has threatened to push out the teaching of Scripture. Time is limited in the schools. In many cases two schools share the one school for half a day each. And there is a severe temptation to drop Scripture as a non-essential subject, and to concentrate on the 'three R's.' And further, evacuation may well lead to the weakening of family ties as well as the dislocation of the educational system, with, on both counts, serious loss to the children. No doubt there is another side. Evacuation has led to a closer personal relation between teachers and children, and this does present a priceless opportunity to the teachers. But the negative side is real and serious.

Then there are the intellectual difficulties. These are present to the minds of most of the writers in the magazine. Thoughtful boys and girls will be faced with questions about the relation of New Testament Christianity to war in general and to this conflict. Is the gospel an old wives' tale? Is force the only remedy? Can a Christian fight? And there is the other kind of problem—the social. One headmaster puts this with great frankness. To the younger generation it seems self-evident that if a nation misuses or fails to use its resources in men and material, allows its skilled workmen to fall into demoralization, on the grounds of some economic necessity of which they do not see the force, lets its land go sour, destroys its timber and flings back into the sea the harvest of food which, if it cannot be sold, might be given to those in need, that nation is hard put to it to justify its existence.

And there is a problem which stands by itself—the class cleavage in education. This has been surmounted largely in the universities. State and county scholarships have brought many boys to Oxford and Cambridge, and to the more democratic universities of Scotland. There they have held their own and passed to posts of importance. But in the schools there is a different story. Here there is a wide gulf between the children of the wealthy educated at expensive schools up to the age of

eighteen, and children of the less well-to-do leaving the elementary school at fourteen and plunged at once into the business of life. And it is a matter not only of years spent in education, but of the whole quality of the education for mind and character alike.

Mr. Middleton MURRY (in *The Price of Leadership*) has pointed to one result of this contrast. The 'public school' education trains *leaders*. Mr. MURRY says that the lack of leadership is the present weakness of the Labour party which ought to play a big part in the changes to come. And this alone shows that the abolition of the Public School type of education would be a national disaster. What is needed is not to destroy the Public Schools but to make them accessible to all. And this, says Dr. Cyril Bailey, who writes on 'The Schools and Christian Democracy,' can only be done by bringing the Public Schools into the national system under the Board of Education.

We have been pointing a finger at some of the questions raised by the interesting articles in *Religion and Education*. Let us glance at some of the positive suggestions in the same pages as to what should be done. Mr. JACKS singles out for emphasis what must seem to experienced Christian teachers a point of the greatest moment. He says 'let us stick to the Bible and remember that *we are teaching not history or literature, but religion*.' The italics are ours, and we use them because we regard this saying of a very successful and experienced teacher as containing the First and Greatest Commandment in religious education.

Many teachers delude themselves with the idea that if you teach the 'facts,' these 'facts' will somehow have a magical influence in producing religious results. But the Scripture 'facts' are the incidents *plus their meaning*. The mere history or literature of the Bible is not more religious *in itself* than the history of Britain or English literature. What makes it religious is its significance, the message of God's will for us, in it. We shall never have religious education in our schools till the teachers get over to the children the divine reality in the Bible, the 'Word of God.'

The second suggestion of Mr. JACKS is that we should teach the reality of the living God, the God with a purpose, the God who not only did things but does them now. 'Boys and girls to-day are acutely conscious of the senselessness of things, and they, even more than adults, ask that sense should be made somewhere. It can be made in this conception of God, and it can be made in no other way.' But even more vital is the fact that this truth illuminates the failure of mere humanism, which is largely responsible for bringing our civilization to its present pass. Nearly every religious writer of note has lately been emphasizing this bankruptcy of humanism. It has been thoroughly tried. It has had a long innings, and it has been shown up. The very disasters of the present are a fresh opportunity for teachers to teach the reality of God and His sovereignty.

Finally, Mr. JACKS deals with one of the most serious of the intellectual problems that face children to-day: Can we worship the Prince of Peace and at the same time take part in a cruel war? Mr. JACKS has a rather unexpected answer to this. He directs attention to the kind of peace of which Jesus was the Prince. 'My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.' That is the 'peace that passeth understanding,' which may be won in the midst of conflict, and which may sometimes be won in no other way. It is something that has to be made every day, that demands activity and as much vigour and courage and self-devotion as the making of war demands. By peacemakers Jesus meant not those who sign treaties, but His soldiers who are enlisted in a great warfare. If the generation now at school is ever to achieve a peaceful world, it must think of peace in terms of active service.

This does not dispose of pacifism. And Mr. JACKS admits that we must go deeper. His final answer to the question is that a man's duty is what he owes to God, and the test of his duty is whether he can bring it into the presence of God and still feel it right. Even this may not be an answer. But it gives us something better than an answer. It points the way in which an answer may be got.

Constructive Theology.

VIII. Reconciliation.

By the Reverend Canon J. K. Mozley, D.D., London.

It is, I suppose, not the best known of his books; but there would be much to be said for the view that, taken as a whole, Dr. Denney's volume of Cunningham Lectures, which bears the title, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, is the most satisfying because the best proportioned and balanced of all his writings. It would hardly be right to speak of it as revealing a Denney who had mellowed, if by mellowing were meant a less acute sense of theological inadequacies and a less trenchant capacity for describing them. The old fire was very far from having burnt itself out: the argument that Christ would have redeemed mankind, even if there had been no Cross or Passion, is characterized as 'neither profound nor sublime, but irrelevant. To an unsophisticated Christian, to talk of a redemption to which the death of Christ is not essential is to talk about nothing at all.' As compared with the Christianity of the New Testament that which is expounded by a celebrated Anglican divine 'has *no pulse*.' Of the refusal of the authors of a famous commentary to enter into the question of the meaning of propitiation he says, 'In spite of its sincere humility one may doubt whether Paul would have appreciated this attitude to his exposition of the divine righteousness: it strikes one as rather English than either apostolic or philosophic.' Denney never lost his power of saying what he thought with extreme plainness of speech.

But in this, last, theological gift to those whom he had greatly enriched by his previous writings, there is a width of—neither sympathy nor understanding is quite the right word, though each of them contains some of the truth, which was certainly not the most observable of the good qualities that marked his other books. He was, or at least he generally revealed himself as, more deep than broad. The former adjective applies to him as much as ever in the Cunningham Lectures; the other may now with less difficulty be used of him. Thus, there are two passages in which Denney speaks about love and its relation to God and Christ and sin which it would, I think, be difficult to parallel in earlier writings. It is not that Denney ever imagined that great words like propitiation or reconciliation could be understood apart from that key to their meaning which love supplies; but the wide sweep of his thought as he dwells upon the fact of love, and his almost devotional attitude towards it, have something in them that is almost surprising, and makes without doubt a great, final, conclusion to his long years of study of the New Testament. And whatever else may be worth while in this article it will be all that to bring to the notice of readers words that many of them will once have read and not all will have remembered.

'In the last resort, nothing reconciles but love, and what the soul needs, which has been alienated from God by sin and is suffering under the divine reaction against it, is the manifestation of a love which can assure it that neither the sin itself nor the soul's condemnation of it, nor even the divine reaction against it culminating in death, is the last reality in the universe; the last reality is rather love itself, making our sin its own in all its reality, submitting as one with us to all the divine reactions against it, and loving us to the end through it, and in spite of it. Reconciliation is achieved when such a love is manifested, and when, in spite of guilt, distrust, and fear, it wins the confidence of the sinful.'

And in a later passage, speaking of the death of Jesus, he says:

'We feel that we can do no more than regard it as the consummation of His life. We find it indispensable to set it in the light of the whole impression made on us by the life. That impression is not in the least ambiguous. The life of Jesus, from beginning to end, is in all its relations to others a life of love. It is love, then, we have to understand. Without love, there could be no reconciliation, and

what we have to discover is how love functions—what it does, suffers, or promises, in relation to man as a being in need of reconciliation to God.'

Such is the language of true interpretation. There are interpretations of Scripture and of Christian theology, which, while setting out with the entirely right intention of making the text or the doctrine intelligible to the mind of to-day, simply miss the point, and are no more than misinterpretations. Denney was never so severe as when he believed himself to be in contact with such incompetence.

If one is thinking of the Christian doctrine of reconciliation in respect of its Biblical strongholds, one may doubt whether it is possible to penetrate further than Denney did into its inmost citadel. Here, at least, he was great, both on the expository and on the constructive side. But there are always questions which can be asked, either as direct inquiries into the meaning or tenability of some element of the Christian faith or as bearing upon it. It is obvious that no doctrine can be affirmed without consequences ensuing for the way in which men should think about the nature of human life. Moreover, no doctrine could be maintained unless man's persistent thought and experience gave it a general intelligibility and brought it within the general character of his experience. That is not to say that the divine revelation which is involved in every line of the Creed can be subjected to a human test, as though nothing could be accepted as true unless its pattern conformed to some standard that it was within the power of man to set up as regulative. There is no such standard by which man can pass judgment upon the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation and of the Atonement. There is no pre-established human *schema* concerning life and death and the sequel to both into which the resurrection of Christ neatly fits. But if in the assertion of these doctrines we thought ourselves away from everything that in our ordinary experiences and in our reflexions upon them we had come to recognize as real and true, it would sooner or later prove impossible for us to affirm our ' belief ' in such doctrines.

But the experiences of life vary from age to age. Such changes cannot be without their reactions upon Christian doctrine. This is familiar enough to the student of that doctrine, who sees how the form of its expression has been affected by new habits in philosophical thought and social custom. Nowhere has that been as obvious as in connexion with the doctrine of atonement and reconciliation. Yet that was a matter of theoretical explanation of the way in which Christ's work possessed its redemptive character. Feudal or penal or exemplary ideas were borrowed and made to serve as vehicles for the elucidation of an act of God that had come within the compass of human life. There was no notion of human life and thought as subject to such radical changes that the very substance of doctrine would cease to have a meaning for men of a later generation.

There are some who seem to think that a change of this kind has come to pass, and that, in consequence, Christian theology can have no living appeal to the present age. It is accused of speaking a language which is unintelligible to men and women who have been trained in ways of thinking which are derived, not from the ancient world of Israel and Greece, but from the world of modern scientific experiments. The *philosophia perennis*, in praise of which Roman Catholic theologians and Dr. Inge are at one, is, so it would be argued, of merely archæological significance.

It is extremely interesting and important to note that the whole of this kind of anti-Christian polemic is at its weakest when it comes to a consideration of the doctrine of reconciliation. For just here, what the Christian Creed affirms is least connected, so far as its substance is concerned, with any particular set of conceptions, whether they be those of Greek metaphysics or of modern physics. The direct dependence upon the Bible is nowhere more obvious than when the sources of the doctrine of reconciliation are being investigated ; and the Bible speaks at this point with the utmost clarity and in accents that bring to the mind the language neither of the Greek schools of philosophy nor of the laboratories of modern science. Those accents, while so notably the Bible's own, have their echo up to a certain point in some of the most remarkable of man's achievements in the realm of art. That man needs to be reconciled to something, is a conviction

to which, as Dinsmore shows in his book *Atonement in Literature and Life*, one great writer after another bears witness. In some, the reference to God as the One with whom reconciliation is necessary, and the One from whom the boon of reconciliation must come is much clearer than in others. It is much clearer in Sophocles than in Shakespeare: Oedipus at Colonus is reconciled to Heaven (I use the vague word deliberately, so as not to say too much or too little) much more evidently than is Lear at the end of his terrible sufferings. But the differences which are to be recognized do not obscure that fundamental unity of perception of a need, and also of a possibility, which must be met if human life is not to be written off as tragedy—or farce. The saying about life being a tragedy to him who feels and a comedy to him who thinks, was born of a profound pessimism as to a verdict of approval being the true verdict that a dispassionate observer could pass upon man's earthly existence. It may be noted that P. T. Forsyth, quoting that saying, added to it his own most characteristic addition, 'it is a victory to him who believes.' The spirit of faith can look forward to reconciliation, as neither the spirit of tragedy nor that of comedy can, if either is regarded as in itself, and without any reservation, the true interpreter of life.

The question of reconciliation is one that humanism cannot avoid, since the experience of its lack is one that leads to as much, perhaps more, of the sense of frustration and desolation as any that befalls the members of the human race. Whether humanism by itself can charm it away is another matter. A humanism that takes no account of God would not seem to be very capable of doing so, if the last twenty years furnish reliable evidence. Apart from God, and a reconciliation with Him, man would not appear to be very successful in becoming reconciled with himself (either individually or corporately) or with his environment. If Wordsworth's 'homely nurse,' that is, this earth and the natural order as a whole, not only makes her foster-child, man,

> Forget the glories he hath known,
> And that imperial palace whence he came,

but also deny that there is any such palace or One who is its Royal Owner, it is not so easy for her to reconcile man to his diminished status. If there is only man and nature, and not God, it is most doubtful whether any true reconciliation between nature and man, who is not what nature is apart from man, is possible. The Christian can believe in a unity between nature and man, since both nature and man come from the hand of God. But it is a different thing if man is conceived of as nature's true child, as coming into existence in the course of the evolutionary process, and with such powers developed in him as set him by himself within the natural order. Above all, he is conscious of the fact of death: that consciousness is his and his alone. He knows that death not only claims him as an individual but as a race, and that nature will still be there when he has gone. This, more than anything else, makes of any 'cosmic emotion' that any one may feel a one-sided character. There is no movement from nature to man; man may draw out of nature whatever healing and consoling qualities he believes he can find in her. But they are in her simply because man finds them; they have no independent and prior existence; they bear no resemblance to that love of God of whose creative nature the apostolic writer was thinking, when he wrote, 'We love, because he first loved us.'

Any humanism which dispenses with faith in God is faced with the problem of showing how (if in any way) man who is personal can find reconciliation with an impersonal order. Such a manifestation is given by Walter Lippmann in the final section of his book, *A Preface to Morals*. The idea of reconciliation is not that which the distinguished author has chosen as a description of that relation to life which he believes 'the mature man' can reach; but the description which he gives is one which would justify the use of the word. The two last sentences are significant for the extensive claims as to a man at one with his surroundings. 'Since nothing,' writes Mr. Lippmann, 'gnawed at his vitals, neither doubt nor ambition, nor frustration, nor fear, he would move easily through life. And so whether he saw the thing as comedy or high tragedy, or plain farce, he would affirm that it is what it is, and that the wise man can enjoy it.' The Christian may or may not be right in thinking that on any of these hypotheses life is

revealed as utterly meaningless and unsatisfactory. What is most illuminating is that Mr. Lippmann's wise and mature man is regarded as taking up an attitude to life, which is that of a looker-on at a theatrical performance, though with this difference that the looker-on is also an actor. Now, this modern mature man is not without obvious and important resemblances to the wise man of Stoic philosophy, as he can be viewed in the writings of Marcus Aurelius or Epictetus. His religion is much more like that which those eminent Stoic philosophers professed than that which the men of the New Testament professed. But it is incredible that they would have tolerated the thought, or, if that is fairer, the comparison of life to a stage-play. Epictetus, in particular, has the strongest sense of life as to be conformed to the will of God. It may be that such an attitude to life as Mr. Lippmann's is the logical outcome of a pantheistic theology, and shows how unnecessary it is to bring in the idea of God, when the reality of things (Mr. Lippmann's thing that is what it is) is in no way altered, but only differently described, by the introduction of that idea. It does not follow that it is an attitude which the modern man, if he wishes to be wise and mature, is bound to take, or that those who take it have found in their own experience a spiritual equivalent to that reconciliation with God and acceptance of His will wherein the first Christian believers found so rich a store of happiness.

The story of the universe, when in the story there is no place for God, is one that, in respect of its development and of the final issues of that development, is merely the expansion of the story of the origins of the universe, so far as in our backward search we can trace those origins. A story of creation it is not, since creation is quite the wrong word to use. All that we may say is that something always existed, and that from that something everything has emerged, by a process that works on and on without conscious purpose, though in its course, at some point, beings appear who understand, through their own actions and experiences, the notion of conscious purpose and have held the view that such purpose has been at work outside themselves, and in connexion with the whole story of the universe. But to hold that view means the rejection of any world-view which is non-theistic. It is to bring a meaning into the story which otherwise is not there. If there is no God there is no meaning or purpose. The unrolling which has gone on has not added a whit more purposefulness to the universe than there would have been if there had been no unrolling at all.

On the other hand, Christian theology, by its affirmation of the creative work of God, affirms at the same time the reality of meaning and purpose in the universe. For God, as the Bible and the Creed speak of Him, is no impersonal force, but the living personal Author and Giver of that good thing which is being and life. And in the creation of man God implants His own image upon a part of creation, giving to it the power of response to His creative love. It is the refusal of that answer of love which is the real world-tragedy. The tragic interpretation of life is not man's possible verdict upon life, one verdict, while, as we saw, there might be others. No ! The tragic interpretation is God's interpretation —so long as man looks at life as though it were his own to do what he likes with, and ignores the first commandment and the duty of obedience to God, who created him. This real tragedy present in life is inseparable from the truth of God's holiness and God's love as the Bible makes them known. Man in not acknowledging that truth, in ignoring it, and behaving as though it were not true, undoes, so far as that is in his power, God's work in creation, and frustrates the divine purpose. So, as St. Paul says, so long as this is his state, he is alienated and an enemy in his mind. From it he needs to be recovered, and to be reconciled to God.

Reconciliation is the second great act in God's dealing with man, when it is of God's action directed towards the whole of humanity that we are thinking. It has the same universal relation as has the work of creation. It is not a matter that concerns a particular man, or a particular race, or a particular age. It is very noticeable how St. Paul, when he comes to speak of reconciliation, again and again emphasizes its all-inclusive character. His language, indeed, suggests a wider sphere of God's activity and a more majestic result than if reconciliation extended only to the race of men. It is as much a

revelation of the power of God as is creation; more profoundly of His love.

In Epistles written within a short time of one another the Apostle dwells upon this great truth. We meet it first in 2 Corinthians, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself'; then twice in Romans, 'If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life,' and 'if the casting away of them (*i.e.* of the Jews) is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?' In Colossians we read, 'It was the good pleasure of the Father . . . through him to reconcile all things unto himself'; and in Ephesians of the object and result of the blood of Christ being that he 'might reconcile them both (*i.e.* Jew and Gentile) in one body unto God through the cross.' Exactly the same thought, though without the word 'reconciliation' is to be found in the Gospel and First Epistle of St. John, 'God so loved the world that He gave His only Son,' and 'He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.' No language could make clearer that what God gives and does He gives and does for an alienated world—not for a selection out of it—and that what He does He has done. In Christ and His Cross God has recovered and reconciled the world. The fruit of that work, the fruit of the Tree which is the Cross, needs continually to be gathered in; but there is only one tree, one Cross, one work of reconciliation: and over that work stands the inscription, 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish (τελειώσω) his work.'

What James Denney saw and expressed so clearly in his last book is the end and truth of the whole matter. Reconciliation is impossible apart from love, and in reconciliation love is revealed. It is the love of the Father who sent and of the Son who came. And those who have received that love can do nothing better with it than return it as their best gift to its Giver, since 'the love of God was shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost who was given us.' It is, too, the best gift they can give to men—the love which has the promise and power of reconciliation.

The Future of Christianity.

By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D., F.B.A., Emeritus Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

The present war is no mere conflict between contending powers. There are ideological differences that go deep down and are not confined to Europe, and no ordinary peace can dispel the uncertainty that is now disturbing the world. What the future has in store for us no one can foretell, but it is self-evident that the future of religion—of Christianity itself—is at stake. Fundamental principles are in the balance, and we have to realize that, while there are various strong tendencies hostile to Christianity, there are many loyal Christians convinced that Christianity has a new and great future before it, but no less convinced that some restatement and reaffirmation of Christian doctrine is necessary.

Christianity rests upon the Bible, and therefore upon Biblical research. The Bible, considered historically, illustrates a twofold development, the one that ultimately gave rise to Christianity, and the other, the interpretation of the Bible. Thus in the long run there is development within the Bible, in the Church, and in the progress of Biblical studies, theology, and philosophy. This fact should encourage us to take a dynamic view of the Bible and of our religion. To-day we place the Bible in the framework of our knowledge of history and religion. That the religion of Israel did not arise fully grown is obvious: to a few centuries in the life of Israel we owe all that severs Biblical religion from other religions. But complete though our debt is to the religious idealism of Israel, we should never forget that the old religion was purged by the prophets and was subsequently supplemented by the new creative movement that became

Christianity. Our religion is the outcome of a lengthy history, and it is widely felt to-day that a revival, a regeneration, or a new reformation is called for.

We constantly find that what purports to be 'religion' lacks ethical, social, or intellectual worth; it is not the socializing, unifying force it should be. If there are innumerable souls whose religion satisfies all their needs, there is also an enormous mass of material available to the student of religion; it enlarges his ideas and raises many difficult questions to which the Christianity of the future cannot be indifferent. The world's religions tell of men's convictions of what to them is most real and true, and of outstanding interest are the diverse ideas of life after death. It is often believed that much of the current religious scepticism and moral deterioration is due to our loss of earlier ideas of heaven and hell. Be that so or not, I wish to suggest that in throwing over *particular* beliefs which seem untenable we may easily reject the underlying truths; we can, in fact, 'empty the baby with the bath' and in this way sadly emasculate our religion.

Now we know something of the history of the ideas of life after death. Thus we can look back to the distinction between the sky abode for the celestials (of all sorts) and the subterranean abode for most mortals, the distinction between the realm of the good above and that of the wicked down below being secondary. But other beliefs of human destiny have widely prevailed, and we find (*a*) beliefs and customs which *imply* that the living and dead are not severed, and (*b*) *explicit* speculation, faith or scepticism. That is to say, men quite generally are acting more or less intuitively as though death was not the end of human existence, or they are, in their own way, handling questions of life and death and the possibility and nature of existence after the dissolution of the body.

An absolute conviction of life after death is at least implicit in some forms of human sacrifice. We recall Tennyson's couplet in 'Locksley Hall Sixty Years After':

> Those that in barbarian burials kill'd the slave, and slew the wife
> Felt within themselves the sacred passion of the second life.

Indeed, it was sometimes believed that the dying could convey messages to the dead and that men could be put to death for that purpose. The conviction of a continued existence could justify cruel and savage rites; in itself it was not necessarily of any moral worth. Moreover, India early realized that rebirth or reincarnation might be no boon. In the Old Testament the ideas of another life are incomplete; but the proximity or presence of Egyptians with their precise beliefs in a resurrection, the furniture of Palestinian tombs, and the well-known Aramaic inscription of the eighth century B.C. where a dead king hopes to eat and drink with the Syrian god Hadad—these and other data explain how definite convictions could be bound up with beliefs and practices which the best minds of Israel might repudiate. The beliefs in life after death and of a relationship between the living and the dead must be 'hedged round' in order to guide and safeguard both the beliefs themselves and the religion of which they are essential elements. The beliefs in themselves are not necessarily of ethical or spiritual value; perhaps we may say that they reflect biological facts which it is the function of a true religion to shape and discipline.

In religion, generally, the belief in a continued existence is typically that of being bound up with something that is (or is felt to be) more permanent than oneself: tribal, group, or national membership; a realistic ritual connexion with a stable object such as a tree, stone, or shrine; or relationship with a god. The individual, viewed from outside, is born and dies, his body perishes and he is annihilated. But viewed as an 'event,' he is an integral part of larger and vaster 'events' which in some measure make and are made by him. Finally, viewed from within, our personal growth is a deepening consciousness of our true spiritual field or environment, the ultimate whole of which we are part. All deeper experiences and convictions and all personal bonds and religious relationships can take us away from 'this' world of space-time. We transcend the physical and the 'here-and-now'; only in this way could men ever begin and continue to speak of 'another' world or existence and of some reality that transcends all our knowledge of 'this' world. The world's

religions converge to warn us that our life and thought, and our theology and philosophy will be gravely imperfect if we fail to look at things *sub specie aeternitatis*. Institutions and States are necessary organisms, but the true individual transcends and outlives them; and a new synthesis must be found between the present extreme materialistic concentration upon 'this' world and the past extreme emphasis upon a 'supernatural' realm and the many accompanying ideas and beliefs that have lost the force they once possessed.

Creative religious experience is not an addition but a growth; it is not a peculiar accomplishment, gift, or endowment, but is open to all. Nor can we get behind the conviction that the relationship between God and man already existed in some way before we became conscious of it. Everywhere are diverse forms or aspects of a few fundamental religious ideas, though men speedily become aware of their ignorance and helplessness in the presence of the great mysteries of existence. We of to-day may indeed reject certain earlier ideas of heaven and hell, but speculation is rare, though we entertain, more or less freely, sundry ideas, perhaps whimsical and fanciful, of Elysian fields, or a Valhalla, or what-not.[1] Death may be bravely faced—but what of the beyond?

Is it foolish even to wonder whether a life devoted to science or history, or to national or social reform will ever know the answers to its questions? We are agreed that we should think of posterity and should endeavour to leave the world better than we found it. Indeed, it is remarkable how widespread is the feeling among rudimentary peoples that men and the gods need each other, and that man must play his part—along with the gods—in 'running' the Universe. There is the widespread conviction that the gods, nay, that God Himself cares for His creatures; perhaps we should acknowledge more than we do that there is a God who knows our anxieties and troubles. There should be, in a sense, a co-operation, though what we mean by this will turn upon our particular doctrines of God, Man, and the Universe. In spite of our ignorance we should ask, Do we really believe that the world of to-day means anything for that supreme Spiritual Power we call God? Do we really believe that there is or can be some relationship between Him and us? We tend to leave off thinking too soon.

When we think about human existence after what we call 'death' does it occur to us that in some way we may come to know the issue of our toils? We cherish the hope of meeting those whom we have loved and lost, but we scarcely think of meeting those whom we have wronged and injured! Shall we perhaps know, even as we are known? (1 Co 13^{12}). Our answers turn upon our ideas of God. If there is a relationship between Man and the God of the Universe, there may or may not be the heaven and hell of old-time belief, but we cannot ignore the possibility—to use no other word—that we are making and marring *our* Universe and that in our wrongdoing it is *our* nest we are fouling. Thus there might be a heaven and hell more realistic and more intelligible than that of many of our beliefs. At all events it is surely necessary for us to think out afresh our convictions of God, Man, and the Universe, for our ideas to-day are gravely imperfect, although such convictions as you and I have usually *imply* much more than we trouble to consider.

In conclusion, the world situation to-day calls for a reaffirmation of Christianity. Confronted by totalitarian -isms, it too must be totalitarian—though in the best sense, claiming and guiding the whole individual, insisting upon his responsible place in God's Universe, and expounding the reality of Him in whom we live and move and have our being. In recovering the realism of Christianity man will feel anew his unworthiness and helplessness and his need of a Saviour; and when we consider what Christianity has achieved in the past, can we doubt that its greatest victories have yet to be won? The future of religion is a subject not only for prayer, but for courageous, trained, and sustained thought; and the more steadily we try to diagnose the sickness of to-day, the more clearly shall we see that the future of human progress and the future of Christianity are one.

[1] Everyone knows of stories, not irreverent, and not systematically pursued—*e.g.*, the scholar who had written a book on Jeremiah and who felt, when visiting Jerusalem, that he must go to Anathoth, else, as he remarked, how could he face Jeremiah in the next world!

Literature.

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER BOOKS.

The Christian News-Letter is a weekly, edited by Dr. J. H. Oldham. It was started in October 1939, under the auspices of the Council on the Christian Faith and the Common Life as part of a concerted effort to understand the meaning of current events so that the way to right action may be found. It provides a means whereby individuals and groups all over the country may be united in this common enterprise. Among those who are collaborating are the Archbishop of York, Professor Ernest Barker, Canon Barry, Dr. S. M. Berry, Miss Margaret Bondfield, Sir Stafford Cripps, Miss Dorothy Sayers, Professor C. H. Dodd, J. Middleton Murry, Canon Quick, Dr. Charles Raven, and many others.

In connexion with the News-Letter, and with a view to the fuller treatment of the questions with which it deals, a series of shilling books is being published by the Sheldon Press. Those responsible for the series are convinced that revolutionary changes are necessary if a Christian Society is to emerge. They regard the war as a symptom rather than a cause, in that it merely brings to the surface the deep-seated maladies of modern civilization. As Christians they believe that times of crisis and suffering are God's opportunity.

The four books sent to us are the following: *Europe in Travail,* by Mr. J. Middleton Murry; *Education and Social Change,* by Professor Fred. Clarke; *Christianity and Justice,* by Canon O. C. Quick, and *The Message of the World-Wide Church,* by Dr. William Paton.

Probably the most important of the four, and certainly the most interesting, is Mr. Middleton Murry's. It contains his broadcast addresses to which recently many people looked forward eagerly, week by week. The core of his argument is that this is an age made and dominated by the machine. One result of that is an immense body of unemployment. This would not be bad if we realized that it means the liberation of human capacity for the further development and enrichment of the life of society as a whole. There are two possible ways of using the waste which is involved in unemployment—either by employing it in existing industry and so giving the rest of the workers more leisure [by all working fewer hours], or by setting it to work on new enterprises of positive national importance, the embellishment of the common life of which Mr. Murry makes much.

Mr. Murry discusses three ways of dealing with Industry—Individualism, Totalitarianism, and a 'third way.' The third way is Socialism, or, 'if you can't bear the word,' let us say a new social discipline. What we want kindled in people's minds is the conviction that certain things *must* be done. Collectivism in one form or another is coming to every nation. The question is simply how we will have it—Totalitarian and brutal, or Democratic and human. Mr. Murry sees no hope of the solution but in the Christian way, and his last chapter on 'The Inspiration of the New Democracy' is worth pondering. It carries us back to the central Christian doctrine—regeneration.

Canon Quick in his book, *Christianity and Justice,* points out that men have a twofold loyalty, to the State and to God. It is against the background of the dual revelation of God to man, and the dual relationships of men to one another (of justice and love), that we must view the problems of Christian conduct in this present world. The Church must not confine itself so exclusively to its gospel of love that it has no message to give to the men who are actually fighting. God reveals Himself in Law as well as in Love, and it is the Church's duty to teach the law of righteousness. This duty was never so urgent as it is to-day.

Professor Clarke on *Education and Social Change* has done a thorough piece of work. His subject is one that is engaging very wide attention, as readers of the 'Spectator' will remember, and Professor Clarke writes as one who has a grasp of the whole field. He definitely regards educational problems from the side of social significance, and in his book he reviews first what he calls the 'Historical Determinants,' then discusses the present situation, and finally sets out his constructive ideas in 'lines of readaptation.' He is conservative enough to maintain what is good in the tradition, and believes the educational system is capable of re-shaping on a Christian basis. There is a good deal here for the professional educationist, but Professor Clarke writes mainly for the plain man.

Dr. Paton's book on *The Message of the World-Wide Church* is more general. It contains a very sane account, first of all, of what the gospel really is, and shows what this gospel has done in every part of the world. On this basis Dr. Paton considers what the Christian Church can now do for world order.

SUNDAY.

A very thorough piece of research on the observance of the Sunday in this country has been done by Mr. W. B. Whitaker, M.A., Ph.D., and published in a book, *The Eighteenth-Century English Sunday: A Study of Sunday Observance from 1677 to 1837* (Epworth Press; 13s. 6d. net). The book has a twofold value. Besides its ostensible purpose, it gives us a clear and interesting picture of social life during the hundred and sixty years that are reviewed. Dr. Whitaker draws upon all sorts of documents (his bibliography occupies eighteen pages !), manuscript sources, magazines and newspapers, Acts of Parliament and Parliamentary records, pamphlets and books. His industry is appalling to contemplate. But the result is not only informative. It is in many ways fascinating. This is due largely to the fact that it is the social as well as the religious significance of Sabbath-keeping that the author keeps before him.

The book not only interests. Inevitably it raises questions that lie beyond a mere historical record. For Protestants the Reformation gave expression to the ideal of Sunday observance, and, so far as this question is concerned, the story of the years since then is about the way Parliament tried to enforce the ideal on the people of England. To what extent was this attempt successful? The year 1677, with which this record begins, was notable for an Act on Sunday Observance which is actually in force to-day. And since then Act after Act has been passed to confirm that of 1677 or to modify it. But the record is not encouraging. It seems to be one of the lessons of history that laws of this kind can only be successfully applied when the faith and conscience of the people are behind them. This does not mean that Governments are to be daunted by the loud-voiced people who are always 'again' authority, and especially moral and religious authority. But it is one of the lessons of such a story as this that law can only operate when there is a real opinion in its favour. And it is interesting to note how much such a movement as that which began and spread Sunday schools over the land did for the reverent religious and social keeping of the Lord's Day. Dr. Whitaker has given us a valuable book.

CHRISTOLOGY.

In *Two Ancient Christologies* (S.P.C.K.; 16s. net), the Rev. R. V. Sellers, D.D., Warden of St. Augustine's House, Reading, has produced a work of impressive scholarship. The sub-title is fully descriptive 'A study in the christological thought of the schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the early history of Christian doctrine.' While its main purpose is historical, the author suggests that the old problem which rent the unity of the ancient Church is of living interest and importance. In the nineteenth-century theology was interested chiefly in 'immanentism,' and the explication of values in this world and its civilization. Now that we are confronted with a threat of the failure of our civilization, the pendulum is swinging away from immanentism towards transcendentalism. That is to say that while the nineteenth century emphasized the point which the ancient Antiocheans were concerned to make, more recent thought tends towards the Alexandrians. Yet Dr. Sellers strongly holds that the element of truth in the Antiochean position must be safeguarded.

We have a very able account and discussion of the fifth century controversy. It was very bitter, and in its consequences proved to be 'one of the major tragedies of the Church.' The root of that lay here—that there was wilful misunderstanding and perversion of the views of the other side. In what each party was really trying to say there was a great deal of common ground had the opponents only searched for that. Instead of that they forced on each other interpretations which each would have indignantly repudiated. The Antiocheans with their insistence on the real Humanity, and the Alexandrians contending earnestly for Unity of Person were both right, and a mere difference of emphasis was all that really separated them. Dr. Sellers pleads for a christology which will conserve the truth emphasized by both. With that all will agree. But it is not easy. The old problem remains—if Christ was God incarnate, could His Humanity be what it is for us? And if not, is it rightly to be termed 'humanity' at all? Probably our thought must just keep swinging between the two poles—on the one hand, the incarnate Son of God; on the other hand, the man Christ Jesus. We are deeply grateful, however, for a book which carefully documented is a safe and illuminating guide through the historical labyrinth and suggestive of reconstruction.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PASTORAL WORK.

The Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of London, the Rev. Eric S. Waterhouse, D.D., M.A., devotes himself in *Psychology and Pastoral Work* (University of London Press; 7s. 6d. net) mainly to practical rather than

theoretical topics. The book is vividly written and abounds in appropriate illustrations. It is evidence of the truth of the author's contention that in getting teaching across, either in the pulpit or elsewhere, interest is of more importance than value, but, notwithstanding this one-sided statement, the value is there all the same. The construction of the book is its weakest aspect, and the story told of a Scotsman who described a dictionary as 'guid reading but a trifle disconnected' would be not altogether inapplicable to the book which makes use of the illustration. It is good because of its breadth rather than its depth, because of its possible helpfulness in so many different kinds of situations. It would be an excellent manual of practical pastoral training.

But there is depth as well as breadth. The first two chapters especially are a valuable introduction to the question of the general relation of psychology to the work of the ministry, and in the latter part of the book the criticism of Freud is both fresh and acute. It lays bare the Freudian paradox—that all power is assigned to the unconscious in the influencing of life, and yet the remedy prescribed for the removal of all ills is the destruction of the unconscious complex by bringing its confused elements into the clear light of consciousness. Dr. Waterhouse argues that every intending minister should have a general psychological training before turning to the special problems of psycho-therapy, and he holds that psychology is put to the best use if we refuse to adopt unreservedly any system, but acknowledge that each has done service in drawing attention to important factors in human nature. He makes a useful distinction between the physical and the psychological aspect of any disease, and counsels the would-be healer of the sick mind to make sure that a medical man has been consulted upon the physical aspect of the malady. The writer is on the whole optimistic regarding the future of the Church, and thinks that the worst enemy of religion is not antagonism but indifference, which latter would be removable by more energetic and less conventional methods of congregational organization than are often in use. He has an excellent chapter upon the qualities of leadership necessary in a pastor, and his chapter upon 'Understanding One's Flock' is full of valuable advice. The chapters on Worship and Sermon-Preparation are not upon the same level—surely his diatribes on the reading of sermons are a little too severe! The concluding chapter is disappointing, and consists in rather commonplace general observations instead of a summation of the contributions of psychology to the far-reaching work of the Church which would have formed a more appropriate conclusion to a book full of much valuable criticism and advice upon this subject.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

For some time this question has been in abeyance; but nothing is quite so certain in our very uncertain future as that it will re-emerge and demand settlement. On the subject there is a great literature, as the Rev. P. R. Smythe, M.A., B.D., brings to our notice in his book *The Ordination of Women* (Skeffington; 5s. net). Much of what has been written has been forgotten, and some of it deserved that fate; it was blatantly feminist, or obviously obscurantist. And on this subject the mere feminist or the mere obscurantist has no right to be heard. Mr. Smythe's book deserves wide circulation. It gives a historical review of the position of women in the service of the Church all through the centuries, which is as valuable as it is interesting. Mr. Smythe grieves us here slightly, because in his altogether admirable treatment of the Deaconess, and her modern reintroduction, he omits mention of the Deaconess in the Church of Scotland. He writes mainly of the Anglican Church. He tries, in his suggestions towards a solution of the problem, to be impartial. He began, personally, in a position of hostility to the idea of woman-priests, but came to see how unsatisfying and unsubstantial were the objections commonly urged. That seems to be his own position still—he can find no real insuperable objection to women-ministers. He writes, perhaps, overmuch, in a detached way, and sometimes rather flippantly. He is not burning to show the wrong and harmful implications underlying the exclusion of women from the ministry. If we understand him, it is a question not so much of principle as of expediency. It seems to us improbable that any large branch of the Church will find that the matter is urgent on mere grounds of expediency. For the number of women claimants to ordination is very small, and the number of congregations clamouring for a woman-minister still smaller. Mr. Smythe, we are afraid, as a protagonist in the cause will not get far. Yet for its historical survey, as well as its criticism of objections, he has given us a book which we cordially recommend.

DOSTOIEVSKY.

A Prophet of the Soul: Fyodor Dostoievsky, by Miss Zenta Maurina (James Clarke; 6s. net), written originally in the Latvian language, thoroughly

deserves the wider circulation made possible by translation into English. The writer is an enthusiastic but discriminating admirer of Dostoievsky. She has read round about her subject and round about again, and she has herself something of that power of getting inside another person's mind which she assigns as one of the chief elements in Dostoievsky's genius. The arrangement of the book might have been improved, and the style is unequal, but every here and there are to be found illuminating phrases of great beauty.

Miss Maurina first of all tries to place Dostoievsky in relation to European literature as a whole, and to French literature in particular. She finds many affinities between him and Balzac, but her general conclusion is that he is Russian to the core, both in his temperament and his achievements. For one thing, he shares in his countrymen's love of metaphysics, and their readiness to discuss intimate questions even under the most unpromising conditions. Her account of Dostoievsky's life, his sufferings, his passionateness, his tendency always to rush to extremes, awakens and sustains the interest of the reader, and her critical analysis of his novels will prove of great help to the understanding of them. Dostoievsky's interpretation of Christianity is discussed from various points of view, and the authoress is more than ready to accept the verdict of Soloviev and Berdyaev that he was a nineteenth-century prophet of Christianity. She sums up his philosophy of life as a heroic idealism, and in several beautiful paragraphs she shows how behind some of his finest characters there is the overshadowing presence of the Christ. His idealism is, however, much too fluid, too closely related to the movement of life, to be capable of embodiment in concise concepts. 'He paints reality as a dream, and a dream as reality'—is one of the penetrating sentences of the book.

A very 'meaty' volume has been written by the Rev. Wade Crawford Barclay, D.D., on *The Church and a Christian Society* (Abingdon Press; $3.50). It describes itself as 'a discussion of aims, content, and method of adult Christian education'; and it is claimed for it that it is 'the first book on adult religious education to be written with a social orientation.' It is a typically American book. Along with many glimpses into the obvious, it reveals real scholarship and sound sense. We cannot attempt here to summarize its twelve long chapters, each with its sub-divisions. The writer's main conviction seems to be that the Church's supreme duty in such a world as this is to give a Christian education to her own members. He therefore gives out of his own wide personal experience, and an apparently prodigious amount of reading, suggestions as to what this Christian education should be in content and in method. The list of books and pamphlets recommended for reading is overwhelming, life being so short; and we must confess that most of the names adduced are quite unfamiliar. That, of course, may well be our fault and our misfortune. Yet we feel that something more compact and less overloaded would 'get across' more effectively.

Mr. D. S. Mahbub, B.A., a Jewish scholar, has issued a small pamphlet of thirty-nine pages entitled *Bible Document Notes, I.–V.* (M. L. Cailingold, London; 4s. net), dealing with some of the epigraphic material discovered at *Duweir* (Lachish) in Palestine, such as the earliest Bowl Inscription, the Steatite Scarab (Seal of Ahimelek), the Clay Sealing (Gedaliah's), and the Seal of Shebna (believed to be an official at the Court of Hezekiah). The Notes were issued about four years ago for private circulation, but are now published for research workers. Though the pamphlet is written in rather imperfect English, and the price of it seems inconsistent with its size, it is of some value as giving a number of critical views from the Jewish standpoint, and will doubtless interest Old Testament epigraphic scholars.

The attitude of Niemöller and countless brave Christians in Germany, Austria, Poland, and elsewhere under Nazi rule seems identical with that ascribed to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and raises the whole question of whether one should give unswerving loyalty to ruling authorities in all matters or resist to the death any command to apostatize. This difficult question, on which there is room for a wide cleavage of opinion, finds answer in *Render Unto Cæsar*, by Mr. Herbert Loewe (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), a small volume which consists of Lectures given in Cambridge and London, and now revised and expanded for publication. The touching parable of the coin, which gives the title to the book, is of particular interest, not only because of the political circumstances at the present day, but because the action and teaching of Jesus have been misinterpreted by some Biblical readers. The author holds that the subject of the parable was really the association of coins with idolatry. Some devout Jews

regarded certain emblems on coins as definitely idolatrous and refused even to gaze upon them, while others felt that such coins could be used without sin. Jesus, therefore, was faced with the question, Did the use of such money involve offence to God, or was it harmless? He sided with the latter view, and hence His statement, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' a declaration which was a repudiation of the opposite view probably put forward by *agents provocateurs*, and which is in complete harmony with Rabbinic teaching. The book has a special bearing on the relation of citizens to State and authority to-day. It contains considerable scholarship, and should be of particular interest to all who find themselves faced with this problem.

Under the title, *What is Man?* (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net), the Dean of St. Paul's has published some of his recent broadcast addresses. He recognizes that many of the old answers to our constant questions about the mystery of man cannot now be given without considerable hesitation, but this does not for him mean in the very least that Christianity can give no help towards an understanding of the problem. He sets himself to state briefly the scientific attitude, and places the teaching of Christianity in relation to this. Man has a twofold character—in relation to Nature and in relation to God. Man is an animal of the animals, and is also in contact with a spiritual reality. He is indeed supreme in the natural world, but has often put his power to base uses. He might indeed be described as a 'splendid failure,' but certainly not a hopeless failure—if only he could be brought to realize that progress in itself is a meaningless and misleading idea unless we take account of the fundamental truths of the reality of God and the reality of sin. Man's true good can consist only in the development of his spiritual nature, and his aim is to be in perfect harmony with God and to share in the Divine life. Man is only in the making, and it does not yet appear what he shall be. He cannot reach maturity until there is brought into existence a community in which the spirit of Christ rules, and in which men can live together in mutual confidence and loving helpfulness.

The Search Eternal, by Mr. John T. Payne (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), is intended as a series of devotional studies. These studies are not based on passages of Scripture but deal with a great variety of topics connected with Church life and practice. With little penetration or depth of thought the writer discourses very pleasantly from a somewhat narrow and churchly point of view. His chapter on the Two Cultures is illustrative of his general attitude. In it he contrasts Catholicism and Protestantism, saying in effect that while the Catholic holds the great Christian doctrines of the Incarnation, Resurrection, etc., the Protestant is free to hold them or not as he pleases. Such an attitude is really distressing at this time of day. Christian people, however, of the 'Catholic' type, who are ready to accept the teachings of their Church without question or criticism, will find here much instruction about Church doctrines and practices and aids to the Christian life.

Remaking Life: A Challenge to the Christian Church, by the Rev. Albert W. Beaven, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., President of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School (Cokesbury Press; $2.00), is an earnest attempt to arouse Christians to the possibility and duty of life-changing, for themselves and others. Dr. Beaven teaches the subject of Church Organization and Administration in his College and is naturally concerned with what we all realize (more or less), that Christianity is often little more than a name. It does not change people. And the writer asks us to face up to our faith and its claims that it may become a life-changing *conviction*. There is, he contends, a real chance for the Christian message to-day in a world that is longing for a veritable word from the eternal.

Dr. Clovis G. Chappell is widely known in the United States as a preacher and religious writer. The most recent of his books, *Values that Last* (Cokesbury Press; $1.50), contains about twenty sermons with attractive titles. They are Biblical, carefully expository, full of sound teaching and with a warm appeal. They represent American preaching at its best and deserve to be widely read.

If Professor D. W. Riddle's work, *Paul: Man of Conflict* (Cokesbury Press; $2.00), is not supremely original it is a piece of solid and careful workmanship. His scrutiny of the documents has been laboriously done. His sketch of St. Paul centres largely on 'the conflict' as the outstanding feature of the Apostle's spiritual life. Deftly he analyses the phases of Jewish education, the view of the Torah inculcated at home, the general atmosphere of Tarsus likely to develop repressions. He describes

vividly the mental revolution and escape into the freedom of Christ, the wealth and variety of his travels, the immortal issues of his toil. So far the book may be commended. If we join issue with Professor Riddle, it is in his extreme view of the assumed defects of the Luke–Acts narratives which bring them into constant collision with the primary sources in the letters of St. Paul. As a former student of Dibelius the author may be inclined to set a cleavage between these two foundation-data in constructing the life. The book has much to commend it, although it leaves the attentive reader with a livelier sense of the investigator's survey than a grateful indebtedness to the marvels of his hero's struggles, and an intensively vital reaction to such directory as St. Paul affords to fellowship with God. We shall not be accused of stressing minor points, if we remark that our best Old Testament scholars are convinced that St. Paul not only used Greek versions in his quotations, but had at his elbow the Hebrew rendering also, and this Professor Riddle does not sufficiently stress.

A most interesting account of medical mission work has been issued under the title of *In the Service of Suffering*, by Mr. Clement C. Chesterman, O.B.E., M.D., M.R.C.P. (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. net). It is no dry-as-dust chronicle but is full of life and vividness, and packed with telling incidents. After tracing the birth and lineage of Medical Missions the writer goes on to discuss their development and their relation to Church, Community, and State. It is marvellous how, in so small a space, he succeeds in making his survey so comprehensive and so detailed. As Lord Sankey says in the Preface, 'It is a record which will stir in every one of his readers mingled feelings of pride and thankfulness.'

One of the hindrances in the way of a real revival of religious life at the present time is the gap, almost the gulf, between the instructed pulpit and the uninstructed pew. Revival can only come on the basis of certainty or assurance. History shows the truth of this. And to-day the ordinary member of the Church is unsure. He has a vague idea that something has happened to take away the old authority of his Bible. It is that dreaded monster, the Higher Criticism. He does not know *what* has happened, but he has lost the old confidence. And until that is restored nothing will happen in the churches. The Rev. E. R. Micklem has done something substantial towards this desirable state of things in his new book, *A Book on the Bible for Everyman* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Micklem has been tutor and lecturer in Mansfield College, Oxford, and possesses the necessary scholarship to inspire trust. He has a delightful style of writing which will at once commend itself to 'everyman.' And he has set himself to show us all how really the Bible remains the Word of God after it has gone through the hottest fire of criticism. He is concerned with the devotional study of the Bible, that is, with the way of reading the Bible which brings us into touch with God, so that we may hear Him speaking to us. Any one reading this book will find firm ground for his faith in the Bible and its message, and that is a great service.

But Mr. Micklem does more. He shows us how to read our Bible so as to get not only help but interest. He has an excellent chapter on the value of the Old Testament, another on 'how to begin,' another on 'methods,' another on St. Paul's letters and a final one on 'odds and ends.' The whole book is admirable for its purpose. It will both charm and reward everyman, and will give him what we are seeking in this war in another field—security.

Readers who profited by Walter Lüthi's study of the Book of Daniel (cf. The Expository Times, li. 179) will welcome the practical exposition of Amos which he has published under the title *In the Time of Earthquake* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The book is marked by the qualities which distinguished the earlier volume—a keen appreciation of spiritual truth, a fearless adaptation of the Bible message to modern conditions, and a fervid enthusiasm for the gospel and the Kingdom of God. It is even more successful than its predecessor, perhaps because Amos is so essentially a prophet for to-day, and Herr Lüthi has applied his message to our own social and economic conditions with relentless faithfulness. While a closer study of the Hebrew text might have made the book even more impressive, it remains an example of the best type of pulpit exegesis. It is translated by Mr. J. L. M. Haire and Mr. Ian Henderson.

The Approach to Christ (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M.A., D.D., is a collection of devotional studies of value in themselves and serving as a reminder of the wide variety of the ways by which men have come to Christ. It appears to be intended as the first of a series of devotional books to be published in annual volumes under the sponsorship of the Literature Committee of the Congregational Union.

In these studies, which are in the first instance Biblical, the evangelistic figures, among others, of Peter and John, Nathanael and Nicodemus, and the figure of Saul of Tarsus are portrayed in their relationship to Christ; while aspects of the life and teaching of Christ Himself are also presented to the reader. The devotional character of the volume is emphasized by the inclusion of an appropriate Prayer with each of the Addresses.

In his book, *God's Judgment on Europe* (Longmans; 4s. net), the Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., the Editor of 'Theology,' makes a thorough examination of the meaning of history. He points out the failure of *Liberalism* in religious thought everywhere, fastens on the machine as the dominating feature of the present age, and concludes that the novel aspect of what has eventuated is the appearance of collectivism as the influential factor. The core of his book is his chapter on 'God's Judgment.' In what sense and to what extent the war is a divine judgment he sets forth in an elaborate argument. And as this rules his thinking about it, he is led to a final statement of the three attitudes possible to a Christian now. One is active support of the war. Another is Tolstoyan pacifism. But there is a third, which Mr. Vidler finds a little hard to clarify, and which the reader will find as hard to understand clearly. The book, however, is full of serious thinking, and its central message of the reality of judgment as a fundamental element in the nature and rule of God contains so much truth that for that alone the book should be welcomed.

Under the title of *The Epistle of Christian Courage* (Mowbray; 2s. net), the Very Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester, has published four Advent lectures on the First Epistle of Peter, delivered in the Cathedral. In the writer's view the Epistle 'has a close bearing upon many of the problems which perplex our minds at the present time.' The topics treated are the Church and the World, Trouble, Hope and Duty, the Imitation of Christ, and the Hope of Everlasting Life. The exposition is clear and interesting, scholarly yet popular, full of edifying matter. The writer has in view a fuller commentary on the Epistle. If it has the quality of this shorter book, it will be very welcome.

No period of English history has been the subject of more minute study and violent controversy than that period of the seventeenth century which witnessed the mortal combat between King and Parliament. In that troubled time Pym was the acknowledged leader of Parliament till he died, and the chief statesman of the Puritan Revolution. His life has been written under the title of *John Pym* 1583–1643, by Mr. S. Reed Brett (Murray; 10s. 6d. net). Considering the place he occupied in his own day it is surprising that only two biographies of him have been previously written, the first being over a century ago. Since these former biographies were written much new light has been thrown upon the general history of the period, which the present writer has made good use of, while he has also done a considerable amount of research in regard to Pym's private life of which so little is known. The result is a very readable account of one who has been called 'the first and perhaps the greatest Parliamentary leader whom this country has produced.' Enough of the political background is given to make the book a brief history of the period in so far as Pym was the leading figure in it. It should take its place as an authoritative and worthy record of a great historic figure.

In Volume I. of *Know Your Bible*, by the Rev. W. Graham Scroggie, D.D. (Pickering and Inglis; 7s. 6d. net), we have the first of two volumes which together survey analytically the whole Bible, and which are to be followed by others treating it synthetically and didactically. In the present one, which is confined to the Old Testament, the author provides a brief introduction of two or three pages to each of the books, followed by a detailed analysis of each. The treatment is thoroughly conservative, evangelical, and practical. All critical and chronological questions as well as those of authorship are avoided, and the moral and spiritual values of the Bible are emphasized. For Bible Class leaders, Sunday School teachers, and those who favour Bible Readings, the book will be found helpful and useful.

In *The Old Testament Shortened*, edited by Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, the S.P.C.K. has issued a volume which promises to be of great value to teachers and others (5s. net). As its name implies, it is an Old Testament anthology from which all superfluous material has been eliminated. The selection has been very carefully made, though it could be wished that more space could have been found for the prophetic literature. The arrangement is based largely on the historical order of the various sections, narrative portions being followed by

specimens of the literature of each period (but does Is 25 come from pre-exilic Judah ?). Passages from the Apocrypha are included. There are most useful paragraphs summarizing the history where it is not covered by passages quoted, and short sections of introduction to each book as it comes. The text printed is that of the Revised Version, with occasional modifications, though, unfortunately, the marginal readings hardly receive the recognition due to them. There is a number of beautiful illustrations, both in black and white and in colour. The utility of the book would have been greatly enhanced by an index of the passages quoted, but even without this it should prove to be of high value to teachers of Scripture.

'From Moses to Moses, none hath arisen like Moses' is a familiar Jewish saying. It is justified by the facts, for while the original Moses was the founder of Israelite religion, Moses Maimonides did more than any other individual to lay the foundations of modern Judaism. Yet to most Gentiles he is little more than a name, and comparatively few have any direct knowledge of his work. Rabbi Charles B. Chavel, Ph.B., M.A., LL.B., therefore, is doing us a great service in publishing an English version of Maimonides' most famous work under the title *The Book of Divine Commandments :* vol. i. *The Positive Commandments* (Soncino Press ; 12s 6d. net). Originally composed in Arabic, the work was rendered into Hebrew under Maimonides' own supervision, and it is from this Hebrew text that Dr. Chavel is making his translation. The Law traditionally contains 613 'commandments,' of which 248 are 'positive' and 365 'negative.' The volume now before us contains all the commandments, followed by Maimonides' comments on the first class. The value of the great scholar's work lay in the fact that he summarized and codified all the traditional interpretations of the Law from the Mishnah onwards. Consequently there are frequent references to earlier writings, especially Mishnah, Gemara and Siphra, which are, presumably, familiar to every Jewish reader. Dr. Chavel has added frequent notes to Maimonides' comments, and these add considerably to the elucidation of the text. We may look forward to the publication of a second volume, dealing with the 'negative' commandments.

The Saving Presence, by the Rev. Grover E. Swoyer, D.D. (Zondervan Publishing House ; $1.00), contains a series of discourses having for their central theme the influence of Christ upon the world through His incarnation and His ever living Spirit. The writer is a popular American preacher and his writing has something of a prophetical rush about it which brooks no delay but sweeps objections impetuously aside. It will hardly carry conviction to a coldly critical mind but is fitted to stir and enthuse those who are already convinced. The discourses abound in illustrative incidents and poetical quotations, some of which are of rather inferior quality. A passionate devotion to Christ and the Christian cause breathes through the whole.

Professor S. A. Cartledge, A.M., B.D., Ph.D., does not do himself justice by the title of his New Testament study—*A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament*[2] (Zondervan Publishing House ; $1.50). It suggests that questions are closed and that all modern ideas are banned. Just as we would rather suspect a book called 'A Modernist (or Radical) Introduction to the New Testament,' so we rather sniff at a 'conservative' one, blatantly so-called. But in reality the author is not so hard-boiled as we would imagine. It is true his conclusions are traditional : John wrote all the Johannine literature ; Paul wrote the Pastorals ; Mark was written in A.D. 50 ; Matthew and Luke 'about 60' ; Acts 'about 61.' But the writer does not accept all this without investigation. His reasons are not always convincing, but they are his own. And sometimes we find him hovering, almost longingly, on the skirts of heresy, or at least of modern ideas. The most unsatisfactory part of the book is the last chapter on 'Inspiration' which is so vague and indeterminate that it can be read as broad-minded or the reverse.

The Old Testament in the Christian Church.

By Professor Dr. Joh. Lindblom, Lund University, Sweden.

In present-day religious and theological discussion, as in general cultural discussion, the Old Testament and Old Testament religion have come to the fore in a quite new and surprising way. The anti-Semitic current now running through Europe cannot but be directed also against the Old Testament, and its prominent place in education, preaching, and theology. 'Away with the Old Testament' is a slogan often heard in these days. In more extreme circles the attack is not merely on the Old Testament itself, but also on everything in the New Testament and in the Christian liturgy that is stamped by Old Testament influence.

If one studies more closely which arguments are cited against the Old Testament, it is very easy to determine them. They are repeated with great monotony by the theoreticians of anti-Semitism. The attacks are first and foremost against the Old Testament concept of God. This concept is said to be fanatically nationalistic and particularist, and profoundly immoral. The Old Testament Yahweh has nothing in common with the Father of Jesus Christ. He is the enemy of all men not of the seed of Abraham, and persecutes them with his hatred. He provokes lying, treachery, and murder. He rewards his own people with coarse material rewards, but punishes his opponents with destruction. An attack is also made on what are called the immoral and unchaste stories in the Old Testament, which are said to be an expression for the low morality of the Jewish people, and the unethical standard of the Old Testament concept of God. Finally, there has been offence at the idea of the Old Testament religion that sacrifice and atonement characterize the regular relation between man and God. The motif of the suffering of atonement, of the Cross, must be rooted out of our culture. Its place will be taken by the ideal of the hero, the radiant incarnation of a heroic conception of life and nobility of soul.

In this, the most recent polemic against the Old Testament, we recognize many of the ideas put forward about the turn of the century by Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and somewhat later by Friedrich Delitzsch. These in their turn had their predecessors in many of the philosophers of the period of Enlightenment. Nay, we can, as has often been pointed out, go as far back as to Marcion, the well-known heretic in the old Church, if we want to find analogies to the modern attacks on the Old Testament. But Marcion saw more deeply than those who now hold his opinions, when he saw the legalism of the Old Testament as the element which divided it from the gospel of Jesus and Paul.

Adolf von Harnack's well-known idea that it is the duty of the Protestant churches to deprive the Old Testament of its canonical authority, and give it a place, though it be the first place, among 'writings that are good and useful to read,' *i.e.* the Apocrypha, is founded on the observation that, as he says, we cannot see what is Christian in the Old Testament. Harnack saw in the New Testament the document of *one* religion, in the old Testament the document of a quite different and lower religion. It followed from this for him that the latter could have no authority by the side of the former.

Another factor of our day that makes the question of the character of Old Testament religion topical, is the so-called dialectical theology. Coming from Harnack's concept of the canon to dialectical theology, we note that the pendulum has swung over in the opposite direction. What characterizes the attitude of dialectical theology to the Bible is the idea that the Old and New Testaments contain quite the same revelation. There is no difference in principle between them. As the fundamental principle is that Christ is the incarnate Word of God, we are necessarily driven to the conclusion that the Old Testament is also a witness to Christ, not only in the prophecies, but in all places where the new world is revealed to us in the pages of the Bible. Emphasis on the unity of the Old and New Testaments must lead consequently to emphasis

on the identity of the concept of God in the Old and New Testaments. The God-concept of Paul, Jesus, and the Old Testament was the same.

The different ways in which the position of the Old Testament in the Christian Church is nowadays determined compel us to reinvestigate this question: What is the relation of the Old Testament to the New, and has the Old Testament still a task to fulfil in the Christian Church? I think the best way to find an answer to this question is to investigate the actual nucleus of Old Testament religion, and compare it with the nucleus of the New Testament. And what should the nucleus be if not the type of religious belief in God, the actual idea of God, and the relation between man and his God.

A vital piety cannot but in its consciousness clothe the Divinity in the form of an idea. The Christian, on the example of Jesus, and in accordance with His message, invokes God as Father. The idea of God is thus taken from the most intimate and personal of the social spheres. Is there anything corresponding in Old Testament religion? Is there anything in the Old Testament that corresponds to the Christian belief in a Father and worship of a Father?

Our answer is: the idea of God in Old Testament religion is the idea of God as chief, lord, or king. Among the modern scholars who have particularly studied this aspect of the Old Testament idea of God are Count Baudissin, Otto Eissfeldt, and Martin Buber.

In the song of Deborah, in one of the oldest documents in Hebrew literature, Yahweh is clearly depicted as a chief of supernatural dimensions, who marches out from Sinai to the support of his people, and leads it in the battle. It is said in many passages of the Old Testament that Yahweh is a God of war. In old Israel there was a book, containing a collection of songs of war and victory, called *The Book of Yahweh's Battles*. When the temple was built by Solomon, the Ark and the Cherubim were thought of as a throne for Yahweh. He was thus thought of now as a king. When, in the vision of his call, Isaiah saw Yahweh sitting on his throne in heavenly majesty, he burst out: 'My eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.' This was not an idea at that moment created in the prophet's soul, but an old traditional way of thinking, that took plastic form in the ecstatic vision. During the dynastic period an opposition to the Jewish monarchy arose among people of strict thinking. The opposition was motivated by the idea that Yahweh alone was king of Israel. Many Hebrew personal names are compounded with the Hebrew word for king, *maelaek*, so that one can see that it is the God of Israel who is thought of when the king is spoken of. The older prophets used the title of king less, for they had another idea of God than the one expressed in that title. But in the post-exilic prophets and the Psalms 'king' is once more a very usual attribute of God.

Now God is not seldom regarded in the Old Testament as judge or father. But these are hardly independent names by the side of the title of king. According to the general Semitic idea, just because he is king, he is also judge, and just because he is king, he is also father. As judge he judges his people with justice, and as father he takes care of his people and their best interests.

To say that God in the Old Testament is thought of as a king, and that as a king he is likewise father and judge, is merely to establish an outer attribute. Something similar may be said of the divinity in several Semitic religions, but the God of Israel has his special attributes. First and foremost we must note that in the Old Testament God has risen above the world of Nature and become primarily a God of history. His relation to his people is not a relation in Nature, but is founded on a historical act. By a historical act Yahweh has chosen Israel as his people from among the mass of the peoples of all the earth. The proof that Israel is Yahweh's people is the wonderful delivery out of Egypt. And since this basic event he has gone on showing, by a number of actions in the history of his people, that he still takes care of them, and is faithful to the Covenant that he once made with them on Sinai.

The fundamental constitutive features of Yahweh's essence, based on his revelation in history, were these two: love and wrath. We shall now analyse each in closer detail.

In the Old Testament love is linked up with

Election and the Covenant. It is the chosen people which is the object of love. In love Yahweh has chosen Israel. In love he goes on behaving to his people in their continued history. In love he takes care of them, in love he chastises them, in love he forgives their sins, in love, finally, he creates for them an ideal future. But this love is not only for the people as such. It is also for the separate individuals in the people, and particularly in post-exilic times the individual comes decisively to the fore as the bearer of a personal relation to God. The individual now knows that he is the object of Yahweh's love, that is, to the extent that he remains in the Covenant and is faithful to the Covenant. The gift of love is expressed in the Old Testament by the word *schalom*. *Schalom* embraces all the inner and outer advantages corresponding to the Old Testament ideal of a happy and harmonious life. Among these is inner peace with God, but also, with equal certainty—and this is to be noted—the fact that the meadows grow, the fields sink under the harvests, the herds increase; among them are also health, prosperity, victory, peace, a long life, and many children.

The second constitutive feature of Yahweh's essence is wrath. In Old Testament religion, wrath is Yahweh's zeal for the destruction of those who break the Covenant. The object of wrath is all the peoples outside the Covenant, who oppose Yahweh's will. The object of wrath is also Israel, when it falls away, fails the Covenant, and tramples the duties of the Covenant under its feet. The object of wrath is also the individual Israelites who fall away from the God of Israel and become like the Gentiles in godlessness and sin.

It is important to note the mutual relation of love and wrath from the Old Testament point of view. It is typical for this relation that love and wrath never attain a full and complete synthesis, but always stand as independent powers by one another's side. In the Old Testament religion there is a constant tension between Yahweh's love and Yahweh's wrath. There are passages that illustrate this struggle between love and wrath in Yahweh with particular clarity. One is Hos $11^{8.9}$: 'Ephraim, how can I give you up? Israel, how can I let you go? How can I treat you like Admah? How can I handle you like Zeboim? My heart recoils, all my compassion kindles. I will not execute my anger fierce, to ruin Ephraim again, for I am God, not man, I am among you, the Majestic One, no mortal man to slay.' Here love conquers wrath. On the contrary, in other passages, wrath conquers. Thus Jer 15^{6}: 'You rejected me, says the Eternal, ever rebelling. So I put out my hand to crush you—I am tired of relenting!'

There is no norm according to which the righteous man of the Old Testament can decide with certainty, whether in a special case he has to reckon on love or wrath from Yahweh. How is one to know whether one remains in the Covenant, or whether one has broken it, and thus forfeited God's grace? So we swing to and fro in the religious consciousness between trust in love and fear of wrath. This uncertainty stamps in many places the righteousness of the Psalter. Once the righteous man says: 'Thy burning wrath sweeps over me, thy terrors have undone me, surging round me without end' (88^{16}). Another time the righteous man may confess: 'His anger only lasts a moment, his favour lasts a lifetime' (30^{5}).

In what has been said above we see what unites the religion of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament, but at the same time what divides them. The common factor is: God is the God of history, working freely in history as a personal will to realize a certain goal of ethical nature, importing the salvation of mankind. The relation of God to man is of a free and personal nature. God is a God who loves in holiness and judges in holiness. Sin is disobedience to the holy will of God. It separates man from God, but through God's power it can be forgiven and conquered. God makes absolute demands of man, which in the last degree consist in the fellowship of love with God, and the fellowship of love with one's neighbour.

But the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament are equally manifest. We may leave everything else on one side, and just take up one: the idea of the love of God in the Old Testament, and the love of God in the New Testament. In the Old Testament God's love is for the chosen, peculiar people, and all those in the Covenant. So the love of God presupposes a certain

station, a certain positive value on the part of the beloved. In the New Testament, the love of God is the love of the sinner, and of the sinner as such. 'God proves his love for us by this, that Christ died for us *when we were still sinners*' (Ro 5^{8}). Jesus said: 'I have not come to call just men but sinners' (Mt 9^{13}). In the New Testament the love of God is for the sinner without respect to merit or worth, and quite independent of whether he belongs to one people or another. Before God, the Father of Christ, all are alike.

If the gift of fellowship with God in the Old Testament is *schalom*, the gift of fellowship with God in the New Testament is εἰρήνη, which is of a purely internal kind—peace with God, sonship, and certainty of the forgiveness of sins. If the righteous man of the Old Testament can never attain full and complete certainty that he is in the grace of God, it is the great privilege of the Christian to know that he is saved from wrath: 'As we are justified by faith, then, let us enjoy the peace we have with God. . . . Now that we are justified by his blood, shall we be saved by him from wrath' (Ro 5). He who believes, 'he will incur no sentence of judgment, he has already passed from death across to life' (Jn 5^{24}).

All this is due to the new revelation in Jesus Christ. In Jesus Christ we have been given a God, who is our Heavenly Father, and in everything behaves to us as a father. The New Testament gives us a complete fellowship with God, the Old Testament gives us a preparatory fellowship. The New Testament is fulfilment. The Old Testament points forward to this fulfilment, and so the Old Testament will always retain its value in the Christian Church.

Besides this, the Old Testament has another task to fulfil in the Christian Church. It not only points forward towards the New, and teaches us to understand the New better, it also has to shield us from certain dangers that we should easily fall a victim to, if we only had the New Testament. It helps to keep alive those features of our religion that might easily be suppressed without the Old Testament. Experience shows that in those circles and times in which the Old Testament has been thrust aside, a number of errors about God, His essence, will, and government, have slipped in, that would have been kept more easily at a distance, if the Word of God in the Old Testament had been living and actual to the mind.

Our inheritance from later Greek philosophy and religion inclines us to create a dualism between God and the world, between heaven and earth. There is among many of us an inclination to draw a sharp dividing-line between body and soul, matter and spirit, civilization and the Kingdom of God. As early as New Testament times, and afterwards often in the Christian Church, there have been people who have seen something evil in the material as such, and something good in the spiritual. This does not agree with the spirit of the gospel. Christianity is in its essence not asceticism. Christianity does not deny the world, but sees in the world with all its forces and gifts means and tools for God and the Kingdom of God. According to the gospel, the world is the world of God, even though sin has become a power there, and it is His both as something material and as something spiritual. Jesus never made a sharp distinction between the material and spiritual in man. He cured diseases of both body and soul; and He counted on salvation for both the spiritual and the material.

There is a defence against such false dualism in the Old Testament belief in God as Creator. God has created the world. Both the material and the spiritual have come from His hand, and rest in His hand. The New Testament rarely speaks of the Creation, but the Old Testament speaks of God as Creator from the first page to the last. And so on this point we need the Old Testament as a complement to the New.

There is also in Christianity a strong tendency to religious subjectivism. We think we can find God by introversion or introspection, *i.e.* by plunging into ourselves in contemplation and meditation. When it is pure, this is the way of the mystic. Others believe that by thought, philosophy, gnosis, they can attain God. This is the way of speculation. The Old Testament protects us from all such subjectivism by stressing with the greatest energy, that God has not revealed Himself within us, but outside us, in the objective process in the Universe,

primarily in history. The events of history are for Moses and the prophets the scene of God's revelation, not the more or less obscure, at all events subjective, feelings and thoughts that arise in our own interior.

There has always been a tendency to Pantheism in Christianity, a tendency to confound God and the world. Pantheism appears in the form of both philosophy and popular religion. God is *one* with life itself, God is *one* with the reason indwelling in the Universe, God is unity in multiplicity. But for genuine Christianity God is not *one* with the world—He is a personal will controlling and governing the world. The Old Testament teaches us this with undeniable clarity and plainness. The word of Paul on the Areopagus in Athens: 'In Him we live and move and have our being'—must be supplemented by the word in Ecclesiastes: 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few.' God dwells in heaven. As a sovereign lord and king He has command over all the powers of existence, and He governs the fates of the peoples with majesty. He has created everything, but Himself He cannot be identified with anything that He has Himself created.

We may go further, though we must now be brief. We can see the value of the Old Testament as a protection from and corrective to partiality and error in the most central points of Christianity. The New Testament would certainly be sufficient if we knew how to read it properly, but we often interpret it according to our own inclinations, and we therefore need the Old by its side.

God appears to us in the Old Testament as the God of *one people*, becoming afterwards more and more the God of *peoples* and humanity, the God of world-history. This is a guard against false individualism, and against the temptation of making God into a God for just small private interests. God is *holy* love and *holy* wrath: this is a guard against all false security and all misuse of Divine grace. God leads history towards a final goal, a Messianic fulfilment: this is a guard against all static conceptions of history which deny that we are moving towards a goal, when God shall one day stand victor over all His enemies, and the Kingdom of God shall be realized in all its glory.

And so we cannot do without the Old Testament by the side of the New in the Christian Church. And we shall teach and preach from the Old Testament in such a way as to make clear for people that which we have not yet received in the Old Testament, but have received in the New Testament. At the same time we shall indicate the high value of the Old Testament, and have it fulfil its task among us of being like a finger of the Baptist pointing to Christ and His gospel and its task of being a guard against thoughts about God that contradict Biblical revelation.

The difference between two religions can often shine out in quite a small feature, in one single little word. We have a bilingual inscription from Malta, in which two Phœnicians and two Greeks do homage to the same divinity—Melkart-Heracles. The Phœnicians call the god 'lord,' *adon*, and themselves 'servants' or 'slaves,' *abadim*. The Greeks, however, speak of neither lord nor slaves, but simply mention their names, and give the god the title of ἀρχηγέτης, which means 'leader,' 'chief' (L. R. Farnell, *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*, 134.)

In this way a single little document, a chance dedication on the base of a column or an altar wall, can flash light over a characteristic difference between two religions. The Semites stood before their god as bowing slaves and thralls, the Greeks as free-born men with raised heads.

In our Bible we also have numerous bilingual texts. I mean the Old Testament quotations translated into Greek in the New Testament. In their Greek form and New Testament context, they often acquire a quite other significance than they had in the Hebrew text.

Let us take an example. In Hab 2^4 we read the well-known phrase about faith and life. In the Revised Version it reads: 'The just shall live by his faith.' But Professor Moffatt has given us a more exact and clearer translation: 'The good man lasts and lives as he is faithful.' In its Old Testament context the phrase means: the man who stands firm in the Covenant, who is faithful to the commands and rules given by God, will have a long and secure life, on account of the faithfulness he thereby shows. It is thus a phrase that expresses

the Old Testament legalistic religion and its principle: God is merciful to him who is righteous, and rewards him according to his righteousness. In Paul's sense and in its New Testament context the phrase has a quite different content. Who is now the righteous man? It is the sinful man, Jew or Gentile, to whom God has graciously granted sonship, and who on that account is pleasing to God. What is it now to live? It is to share in eternal life, life in God, life in Christ, life in the Spirit, an inner life in peace, joy, power, an everlasting life, which is not threatened by death, but extends to existence beyond the grave, and flowers in the resurrection from the dead on the day of Resurrection. And what is it now to have faith? Faith is to have received through Jesus Christ the message of the forgiveness of sins and to live in fellowship with God and His Son Jesus Christ.

The New Testament is the book about God's grace to sinners through Jesus Christ and therefore it is the centre of our ecclesiastical teaching and preaching. But the Old Testament is like the Baptist's finger, pointing forward to Christ, and a safeguard against many errors in the Christian belief. That is why we cannot do without it by the side of the New Testament.

The Conflict between Science and Religion as viewed by an Engineer.

By Reginald O. Kapp, Pender Professor of Electrical Engineering at University College, London.

It is often said that the conflict between science and religion has now been settled. Would that it had. But it seems to me that the present position is even worse than if the conflict were still raging. It has come to be ignored.

It might be argued that the comparatively minor dispute concerning Darwin's theory of evolution has been disposed of. But on more fundamental issues Christian doctrine and the expressed beliefs of our most numerous and most authoritative scientist-philosophers are as incompatible to-day as ever they were. With the sole exception of the vitalists, who seem to be under a cloud at present, our scientist-philosophers deny the existence of any non-material reality. They assert that all events are fully determined in conforming only to the laws of physics and chemistry. They represent the material universe as a 'closed system' unaffected by influences separate from it. Every event which may occur now or in the future, every quality which may emerge from a rearrangement of the component parts of the material universe has, they declare, been determined from the beginning. How can such a doctrine be reconciled with belief in Divine Intervention, Free Will, and the Immortality of the Soul?

The conflict would only be settled if scientist-philosophers were to declare, instead, that the physical sciences prove the existence of active non-material influences which can interact with matter, that the material universe is not a closed system, that events in it may conform to other laws in addition to those of physics and chemistry, and that present and future events and qualities have not necessarily been fully determined since the beginning of the world.

I have searched long and arduously, but in vain, for a scientist-philosopher who has said this. Hence, I have reached the conclusion that the conflict is thought to have been settled only because it has never been stated frankly. A radical difference of opinion has been hidden under a cloak of evasive rhetoric and confused metaphor. Many recent scientist-philosophers have denied that they are materialists; they have made copious use of the word 'spiritual'; they have presented their

philosophy in transcendental and idealistic language not devoid of beauty. Though they have also rejected vitalism together with every other belief in non-material reality, they have thus obtained from churchmen an approbation which they do not deserve.

Were the conflict really incapable of settlement there would be something to be said for thus ignoring it. I can well understand that both scientist-philosophers and churchmen should shrink from too clear a view of the chasm which separates them, that they are both afraid of the consequences of an uncompromising revelation of the incompatibility of their beliefs. With memories of the rather undignified controversy which was provoked by the theory of evolution, we should not judge severely those who prefer to pretend that there are no grounds for disagreement.

As a scientist, nevertheless, I deplore this attitude. And I am, moreover, convinced that the conflict could be settled if only the scientist-philosophers would surrender certain beliefs which are, with them, entirely a matter of faith with no basis whatever in facts. (Some readjustment of doctrine may be required of the churchmen as well, but none, I am sure which involves sacrifice of any fundamental belief.) There is nothing in science to prove that matter is the only reality, and there *is* a great deal to suggest that it is not. There is no evidence that matter and non-material influences cannot interact, and, in the organic world, overwhelming evidence that they do interact. There is no scientific reason whatever for the doctrine that the material universe is a closed system, or that the laws of physics and chemistry are the only ones to which events conform.

With this conviction (which I could justify by facts and not by faith alone if space permitted), I am not at all afraid to state the conflict in the simplest, clearest, and most concise terms I can devise. *Is everything which we observe or experience due to the unaided action of matter on matter?* If it is, Christianity is a superstition. If it is not, the doctrines of the scientist-philosophers are superstitions.

When I say that I believe the latter, I speak as a scientist. I would not venture to speak in any other capacity. The objections I am qualified to raise against materialism are not that it is a false doctrine about the nature of God or the soul, or that it leads to a false system of values. I can only criticise materialism because it is a false theory about the nature of matter. This seems to me so obvious that I am surprised it has not been pointed out before. Every materialist attributes to matter unaided the most remarkable powers and properties. I, as an engineer, know that matter does not possess these powers and properties.

Let us consider some examples. The most unadorned form of materialism is the doctrine known as mechanism. Its adherents combine two statements: firstly, that we are mere machines, and, secondly, that we are due to the unaided action of matter on matter. Thereby they suggest that matter is accomplished. As an engineer, I know that matter unaided can neither design machines, nor manufacture them, nor maintain them in working order. The mechanist is hardly in a position to throw stones at the churchman for being unscientific.

However, mechanism is no longer in favour among scientist-philosophers. Their thought has now come to be permeated more by the philosophy of the late J. S. Haldane and by the philosophy of emergence. I find both equally materialistic and equally unscientific. To the absurd assumptions concerning the nature of matter made by the mechanists they add other assumptions which are, if possible, even more absurd.

Followers of the former doctrine declare that the properties and potentialities of living organisms are manifest to varying degrees in all lifeless objects. In the atom, in particular, they see the prototype of living organisms. According to this philosophy we owe our existence, not to the creative acts of non-material influences, but to powers of matter which have existed unaltered for all time. Similarly, we are told that we are preserved from destruction because the material universe is so constructed as to make the preservation of living things inevitable. I could quote many passages. I will confine myself to one. Speaking of the way an organism comes to be preserved d'Arcy Thompson said in a symposium before the Aristotelian society on 'Life and Finite Personality': 'When the parent tissues have ceased to nourish it, it is not left alone.

All the forces of nature impinge and react upon it, together they nourish it; they mould and conform it; the sun shines upon it; the air bathes it; it is a mechanism, but only part of a greater mechanism, and the mechanism of which it is a portion is the world.' One may quite fairly describe this doctrine as the belief that matter is helpful. Not to God's guiding hand but to that of matter do adherents of this philosophy attribute our survival.

The philosophy of emergence, fashionable just now, is found on close examination to be equally incompatible both with religious teaching and with science. This philosophy has been devised to meet some of the objections to mechanism without adopting belief in non-material influences. It is recognized that there are things which cannot be fully explained in terms of the laws of physics and chemistry. Among these are counted the continued existence of our vulnerable bodies in a universe of some violence, our capacity for thought and feeling, moral values, man's higher social conduct. According to the philosophy of emergence, these things 'emerge' from the way in which material particles are put together, from the relatedness between the component parts of a system. Some adherents have gone very far in the assumption that not only properties but also accomplishments and activities emerge in this way in the absence of non-material influences. It has even been asserted that God emerges from the relatedness between the component parts of the whole material universe. In place of the Christian doctrine that God created the world, we have here the belief that He is its result.

If such doctrines are bad theology, they are certainly also bad science. The reason can be expressed in a few words. *They idealize matter unjustifiably.* Sometimes one might even say that they idolize it. Strange that such an attitude should so often be described as 'no crude materialism.' If asked how the conflict between science and religion can be settled I would say therefore: 'The first necessary step is to learn to appreciate the real nature of matter. No one who understands it properly, however it may be defined, could possibly attribute everything which we observe and experience to its unaided action.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Use Your Waste.

By the Reverend Sidney H. Price,
Great Shelford, Cambridge.

'Let us make brick.'—Gn 11[3].

A little boy who is always asking questions wanted to know the other day, 'Who first made bricks?' Could you tell him? I said, 'I do not know, but bring me your Bible, and we shall find something about it.' We turned to the eleventh chapter of Genesis, the story of the men who started to build the Tower of Babel. Those men said, 'Go to, let us make brick,' but the way they said it sounds to me as though they already knew what bricks were.

Our common bricks seem to have old-fashioned relations. You know, too, about the children of Israel in slavery in Egypt, how they made bricks from clay and straw. They had to work very hard, and when Moses and Aaron asked Pharaoh to let the people have a day for worship, Pharaoh replied that the people were lazy and must work harder. After that, they had to gather their own straw as well as make the bricks.

In more recent years people have been making bricks from concrete and other materials. One of the most interesting of these experiments has been carried out at Bedlington, Northumberland. Outside the pits there were great heaps of waste, such as may be seen in any mining village. If you have seen them, you know how ugly these heaps can be. Some men looked at the waste heap at Bedlington and found it was made of shale and seggar-clay. 'Why not try to make bricks with it?' they said. And they did; and the bricks were so good that many builders wanted some. In the first two years over ten million of these bricks were sold.

It is a good thing somebody has found a way

of using those ugly waste heaps. Some day, perhaps, we shall have a more beautiful country when all the waste is used.

There are other things, too, that used to be wasted and that spoil the appearance of our country. Years ago, a great soap works in Lancashire used to pour hundreds of gallons of waste into the River Mersey. It made the river horribly dirty. Then one of the chemists discovered that this waste contained large quantities of glycerine.

You will think of other things that used to be wasted and are now used. Old rags, for instance, are made into paper. Yet there are still some ugly things around us that need clearing up. This is where boys and girls come in.

I saw a very ugly thing the other day. It was a small boy's behaviour. He was in a frightful temper, screaming, and waving his arms about, and making such a scene. As I watched him, I thought of those waste heaps. One day, I hope, he will learn to use the energy God has given him in a different way. There he was, wasting it in a bad temper. I dare say you know how he was feeling. If you sometimes have a bad temper, do not be afraid of it. Think of those men who made bricks from a rubbish heap that spoilt the countryside, and the men who made glycerine from the waste that spoilt the river. A bad temper is just your energy wrongly used, and God can show you how to put it to a good use.

We can learn to use our anger instead of letting it be master. When William Wilberforce heard how slaves were treated he was angry that men should be dealt with so brutally. He was so angry that he spent most of his life to secure their freedom. That is how God uses anger, and He will help you do the same if you ask Him.

'Bottled Voices.'

By the Reverend G. Olney Davies, Trowbridge.

'They remembered his words.'—Lk 24^{8}.

'Bottled voices.' What a strange idea! When I came across that headline in a newspaper, you can imagine my feeling. I felt I almost wanted to laugh. I have seen quite a number of bottled things. Had the headline said 'bottled gooseberries' or 'raspberries,' there would have seemed nothing strange in that. I have seen these things bottled, and tasted them. But 'bottled voices'—never!

'How in the world,' I said to myself, 'do they bottle voices?' I wonder if you just unscrew the top of a bottle or take out the cork; then speak into the bottle, and quickly put the top on again, and lo! there it is!—a voice bottled!

I took up the paper and began to read what it said about these bottled voices. I found that these voices could be heard speaking again. I knew then that my idea wasn't the right one, because, if you keep the top on ever so tightly, when you take it off you will never hear the sound of your voice or the words you spoke into it. No! we don't bottle voices as we bottle fruit.

I then read on to see how it was done, and found it was an article about some of the methods adopted by the B.B.C. Whenever any great person, such as the King, or the Queen, or any member of the Royal Family, or a great statesman or scholar—in fact, any of the great men or women—stands before the microphone to broadcast, all the time they are speaking a recording instrument is busy making a permanent reproduction of the speech on a disc. That disc is then put safely away to be used at any future time. So the speech and the voice of the speaker can be heard again because both are recorded on the disc. The boys and girls of future generations—fifty or even a hundred years hence—will be able to hear, say, the voice of King George V, or the present Prime Minister; and they will be able to hear the words of advice or warning, of help or encouragement, that were spoken by the great men of to-day.

I wonder if there is something equally wonderful going on inside each one of us. I wonder if, in you and me, there is a parallel to these 'bottled voices'? I think there is. There is something inside—we don't really know how it is done, though we say it is through memory—that is, making a record of the voices that speak to us. These come back quite clearly to us sometimes, as we remember some sentence of advice, some word of help, some message of encouragement, some word of kindness, spoken to us by some one interested in us who loved us and wanted us to be our best.

I want you to remember this little recording mechanism that takes the impression of voices and words. We not only remember the words spoken, but how they were spoken, and the kind of voice that spoke them—whether it was a kind voice or a harsh one, whether they were spoken in anger or in love. These voices help us to shun what is wrong, and to love what is good.

You see the disciples always had that 'bottled voice' of Jesus speaking to them. 'They remem-

bered his words'—remembered how He had spoken to them: remembered if His Voice was grieved when He spoke of some wrong, or in tones of love when He spoke of God our Father. They listened to that Voice, and when those visible lips of Jesus had been long silent, they still heard His Voice and Words speaking to them in their hearts. Others, perhaps, didn't hear His Voice, but they did.

I want you to listen to the Voice of Jesus; to store up His Words; and to remember them. There are voices that others never hear. They speak just to you and to me.

Listen to them!

The Christian Year.

Trinity Sunday.

The Plain Truth about God.

By the Reverend Eric Parsons, M.A., Ph.D., Harrow.

'That which may be known of God is manifest.'—Ro 1^{19}.

It is surprising how many people calmly assume that there is nothing more evident than that there is no evidence at all about God. Perhaps this amazing assumption is made because no satisfactory answer has ever been given to the questions: If there is a God, is He benevolent? And if He is benevolent, is He then impotent? For what is the use of talking about the Divinity of Jesus, or of a 'Trinity of love and power,' if one is not even certain that there is such a thing as divine goodness and love?

In view of such disturbing thoughts as these it does one's soul good to hear Paul roundly declare, 'Whatsoever is to be known of God is plain.' He does not say we can know everything about God. It would be surprising if we could. We cannot know everything about our nearest and dearest friend on earth, but we never dream of treating such a friend as a nonentity merely because his homely features hide much of his essential being. 'Whatever is to be known of God is plain,' much as whatever is to be known of our friends is plain: 'God Himself has made it plain—quite perceptible in what He has made.'

Creation is thus the vehicle of a distinct message about God. And yet, as W. R. Matthews reminds us, 'Many thinkers have said we know nothing of God except through Jesus.' Such a conviction, however, 'seems to argue an unnecessary pessimism about the efforts of the human intellect to understand the universe, and a strange disregard of the religious experience of the human race. It would be nearer the truth to say that we can know nothing of Jesus except through God. First comes belief in God . . . then the centrality and uniqueness of Jesus as the supreme revelation of God.' People would perhaps be less doubtful about the Divinity of Jesus if they were first convinced of the existence of Deity. The divine handiwork can teach us some wholesome truths about the divine being. Jesus read that revelation there, and was amazed that men could be so blind to it. We injure ourselves if we ignore its simple teaching, because it meets our elementary needs and prepares us for Jesus Himself.

1. It tells us plainly that there is a God. Many people do indeed question the bare fact of God's existence; but surely such disbelief in His 'invisible nature' argues a dreadful death in them—the death of wonder. Contrast with such an attitude the unsophisticated outlook of the little child to whom Jesus appealed. 'The earliest exercise of our brain,' we are told, 'is wonderment. A child accepts nothing without wondering how it came to be. That a watch should tell the time does not interest it; it wonders how the wheels go round. It wonders why the stars do not fall, why the waves do not flow over the land, why the flowers have fragrance. Facts do not interest it. The existence of the fact is always its wonder.'

We may perhaps be excused for questioning the goodness or the greatness of God; but how, in the face of a fitness of Creation which fills us with a sort of holy surprise as we behold the heavens through a telescope or the tiniest creatures through a microscope, we can doubt that there is a God surely passes comprehension. For those who have not strangled wonder in reflection, and destroyed their childlike impartiality, God's existence is, as Paul says, plainly manifest.

2. Moreover, 'what He has made' as plainly proclaims that God is great. It is true that the existence of evil raises questions as to His 'everlasting power and divinity.' Indeed, there are those who affirm that God cannot be omnipotent or omniscient; though how their finite minds can dogmatise with such certainty about infinite wisdom and power is perhaps a greater mystery than that which they deny.

When we regard the world with suitable humility, we are bound to admit, with G. K. Chesterton, that 'the pessimists who attack the universe are always under this disadvantage. They have an exhilarating consciousness that they could make the sun and

moon better; but they have also a depressing consciousness that they could not make the sun or moon at all. A man looking at a hippopotamus may sometimes be tempted to regard a hippopotamus as an enormous mistake; but he is also bound to confess that a fortunate inferiority prevents him personally from making such mistakes.'

The universe manifestly declares the supreme glory and greatness of God. And when Jesus in Gethsemane, or any other soul in tribulation, challenges our trust of the Father's ability by asking: 'Thinkest thou not that God is able?' we are bound to confess, because of the glory and strength of His creation, 'He is able.'

3. Paul evidently believes that creation also makes God's goodness as clearly perceptible as His greatness. It is natural to ask why, if God is great and good beyond man's conceiving, He nevertheless tolerates the mystery of evil and pain. We catch a glimpse of an explanation in our gradual discovery as we go through life that suffering, for some if not all, is a necessary discipline. Moreover, freedom is essential to the making of character; and sin, which has followed upon freedom may, with its endless ramifications down the years, go far to explain the suffering of innocents. Perhaps our unhappy plight is one from which God could immediately extricate us only at the cost of independence and moral being.

But God's revelation of Himself in Nature and human life affords more solid comfort than our speculations. We cannot reasonably expect to get more out of the universe than has been put into it, and our world contains countless saintly lives which witness to some fount of goodness. Think of the life of Jesus—guarantee of grace: a testimony not merely to the goodness of God, but to that goodness entering into, and dealing with, sin and suffering on our behalf.

Now all this may seem plain enough to a man like Paul, but another will simply reply: It may be obvious to you extraordinarily endowed folk that God exists and is both great and good; but I am only an ordinary sort of person, and I cannot see it at all. Paul anticipated such a protest in his final argument that the perception of truth is dependent on character as well as knowledge. He writes to some people who professed to be unconscious of God: 'It is not merely ignorance. They stifle and suppress the truth.'

The witness of God's Spirit in our hearts can be disregarded and quenched. When men's characters are warped by vanity or vice they become 'stultified by their speculations and have their unperceiving hearts plunged in darkness.' Take two men to see a wonderful piece of machinery, the one narrowly conceited, the other of average humility and good sense. The first will quite underestimate the creative genius behind the machinery which he sees. The two men will come to totally different conclusions concerning something of which they were equally ignorant: but the difference is in themselves. And with all humility we must acknowledge it may be so with us when we fail to see the glory of God in Creation.

A great German once said: 'When at an early age I first grew acquainted with Shakespeare, I was indignant at his coldness . . . indignant with the insensibility which allowed him to jest and sport amidst the highest pathos. It was insufferable to me that this poet gave me nothing of himself. Many years had he my reverence, my earnest study, before I could comprehend his individuality. I was not yet fit to comprehend Nature at first hand.' Not yet fit to understand—there is the answer to many a man's complaint about God. When we are tempted to grow impatient because He does not seem to show sympathy, does not impart Himself more plainly, we should remember that the fault may be with our own callous hearts and conceited minds. If we give Him our reverence, patience and earnest study the day will come when we too shall be able to read aright the message which He has written for the wayfaring man. We cannot afford to despise this elementary truth about God; for it is, as Paul saw, a preparation and foundation for receiving the fullness of His Spirit's grace through Jesus Christ our Lord.

First Sunday after Trinity.

The Ideal of Love.

'As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you.'—Jn 15^9.

Fifty years ago, and indeed much nearer our own day, discussion went on constantly regarding the Divinity of Christ. People raised the question: Is Christ one with God, is His nature the same as the Father's? That was a vital problem, but it is fairly accurate to say that just at present people are concerned rather with the question whether God is the same as Jesus. They say, we know what Christ was like, for we can read about Him in the Gospels. Can I take the mind and heart of Jesus Christ, as He lived among men and for men, and say to the perplexed, or to my own heart when it is troubled: There, that is what you can rely on at the very heart of the universe? God is exactly like

Jesus, and as Dr. A. B. Bruce once said: 'If God is like Jesus, this world has reason to be glad.'

The best way to answer that question clearly is to discover, if we can, what Jesus believed regarding it. In our text He makes that plain. He tells us that His love for us is identical with God's love for Him. The two resemble one another precisely, part to part, like a die and its impression. In *Paradise Lost* the Angel asks:

> What if Earth
> Be but the shadow of Heaven, and things therein
> Each to other like more than on Earth is thought!

And Jesus is here employing the same argument. He says to the disciples: 'You have learnt to know Me, you have seen that I have you constantly in My heart. That love is a copy of the love I Myself have had from God. He loves as I have loved—you can rest your troubled hearts on that.' Therefore, let us speak of Christ's love, always with the consciousness in the back of our minds that He is, as it were, the looking-glass in which we see God. That great principle can never now be repealed: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

1. *The love of Jesus has no thought of self.* He cared for men and drew them round Him, not for any gain to Himself but solely for their good. Uninstructed writers have called Jesus absurd or fanatical; no one so far as I know has ever called Him selfish. The moral cynic who questioned whether totally selfless love anywhere existed in man or woman would at least be awed and silenced before Him. He does not love for His own sake but for ours. Now and then some wonderful human act of self-forgetfulness comes along of which we say to ourselves: 'Jesus Christ was like that, only better.' When the steamship *General Slocum* was burned some years ago in New York harbour, a lad who was picked up said: 'My mother gave me a life-belt, that's how I got saved. I guess she didn't have one for herself, because they can't find her.' We mount on the stepping-stone of such devotion and from it we catch a glimpse of the still loftier love of Jesus Christ.

When in this unselfishness He gave Himself for us all, what were the objects of His kindness like? Largely the poor, the ignorant, the unfortunate. And in their presence Jesus longed not to get but to give. The merchant says to the world quite naturally: 'Come to me and buy my goods and pay me the price of them.' The orator says: 'Come to me and furnish an audience for my powers of appeal and argument.' The soldier says: 'Come to me and enlist in the armies that will bear my name to renown.' Jesus called to Him all those that labour and are heavy-laden with the simple promise: 'Come to Me and I will *give*—I will give you rest.'

As we all know, the response of men to this unselfish love was a terrible chapter in our history as a race. From His human brethren Jesus did not even obtain a place to lay His head. Instead, He received insult for honour, thorns for a crown, desertion for loyalty, a borrowed grave for resting-place, a cross for a throne. You would have said the whole series of events must kill out religious faith once for all; for how could men continue to believe in the Divine and fatherly government of a world where the holiest life ever seen upon the planet was suffered to sink in shame? And yet what happened was the very opposite. Through the shame and loving sacrifices of Jesus eyes that hitherto had been blind to God's pity opened to it; they saw God's love now for the first time, and they made the response of faith.

2. Then, *the love of Jesus was perfectly clear-sighted.* There is a proverb that love is blind; the uglinesses and deformities in its object escape its notice. That may be true often enough of poor, reckless human passion, wilfully prone to self-deception; but it has no application to the Saviour. He saw men as they were, all the wrappings and concealments torn away; He saw their pettiness, and pitifulness, and disgrace, as He sees ours. He read the heart of man like an open book.

At first it is a nearly insupportable idea that God knows everything about us, the secret motives and hidden imaginations we huddle up even from our own view. *Can* He see us, we feel, can He see us as we are, and at the same time love us? Yes, He can, is the absolutely certain reply, for that exactly is what Jesus did. He knew all about the publicans and sinners, yet He took them by the hand, and looked into their eyes, and gave them the sure knowledge that He was not ashamed to be their friend. He was perfectly aware that Peter had denied his discipleship with oaths, yet He looked back at him with strong and patient tenderness that brought tears to the man's eyes. I want and need a love like that, when I am facing my own life, and remembering what I have done.

When St. John is going to tell how the Redeemer knelt down beside disciples who had been quarrelling about honours and precedence half an hour before, and washed and wiped their feet, he introduces the action with the words: 'Having loved his own

which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.' Unto the end—there was nothing He would not endure, there was no length He would not go. As Shakespeare put it in a sonnet :

> Love is not love
> Which alters when it alteration finds,
> Or bends with the remover to remove.

Without faithfulness, love is a broken reed that pierces the leaning hand. Nothing satisfies except what will last ' unto the end.' Well, Jesus persevered in loving men. He stood in with sinners to the last ; even when the Cross came into it finally. He did not draw back or refuse the price. No gulf that love could not bridge—not sin, or time, or death.

3. Once more, *Christ's is a purifying love.* It makes an unqualified demand for personal goodness.

Every one knows there is a fond and foolish affection, into which parents or acquaintances may fall, that enfeebles and degrades. Its object is to spare the person doted on every sort of pain, every encounter with the rough hardships of life ; with the result that the child comes out of this weakening treatment a creature of neither will nor power. False tenderness has poured the poison of self-pity into his veins. There is nothing more conspicuous in the love of Jesus than its antagonism to all such foolishness of attitude.

Are not some of His most remarkable sayings designed, as it were, to correct the mistaken thought that love on His part leant to weakness or over-indulgence ? He speaks of the narrow way we must tread, the strait gate we must pass through, leaving much outside we should like to carry with us, but which its exactingness will not permit to pass. He speaks of the bitter cup that, like Him and strengthened by Him, we must drink. He speaks of the cross which we must take up. No soft lenity there ! No compromising with the low powers of would-be disciples ! One of the temptations of human love is to flatter the weakness of those for whom it feels a tenderness ; but we search the gospel pages in vain for one occasion on which Jesus bent to this allurement. There was the rich young ruler, who came to Him with eager question, and two companion items above all remain in our memory from that interview—first, that Jesus looked at him and loved him ; and second, that He spoke to him the tremendous requirement : ' Sell all that thou hast, and come follow me.' That was a stringent love, a love that insisted on things being given up, on the right hand being cut off and the right eye plucked out.

God's love, like the love of Christ, is a bracing and exacting thing. It cannot bear the strain of mire upon its objects, but must have them undefiled. And yet all the time it is waiting to unveil to us the blessedness of sacrifice and self-conquest, for the renunciations asked of us are not ends in themselves ; they are preparations for His fuller possession of our lives.

This glorious love comprehends the world. There beats in it the heart of the great High Priest of mankind. The barriers and separations that for ages had shut off men from their brethren go down before the rising tide of His goodwill, and on their faith and penitence He welcomes equally the stranger and the Jew, the ignorant and the learned, the sinner and the Pharisee, the poor and the rich. He can feel for one and all ; He can die for one and all. And yet this comprehensive love, that puts its arms round our whole race, can so narrow and as it were condense itself as to bless and gladden the single needy life. Many times, as some of us may know to our loss, the windy and viewy generalizations of sentimental emotion are accompanied by strange cruelty to individuals, as in the case of the Russian lady, in the old days, who wept in the theatre over the staged sorrows of humanity, while her coachman froze to death on the pavement outside. But Jesus loved both man and men. The love of Jesus bends down to every one of us, in our felt insignificance, in our lonely sorrows, and comforts each by His presence as though there were none other in the world. And the cup of His atoning and personal love is for us all the fuller that it has been held to the thirsty lips of uncounted generations.

That love is the great reality of history.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Suffering.

BY THE REVEREND A. HERBERT GRAY, D.D., LONDON.

' Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you ; but rejoice.'—1 P $4^{12.13}$.

The first word which arrests us here is the word ' Beloved.' We feel that that is so characteristic of the warm-hearted Peter. That is how he felt about his fellow Christians, and it was in that atmosphere of love that he dealt with their problems and needs. Any discussion of the meaning of human pain *must* be carried on in the atmosphere of genuine and warm-hearted sym-

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Sermons*, 141.

pathy or it will fail. We are not therefore surprised that this particular verse begins with the word 'Beloved.'

Evidently the people here addressed had been disconcerted and perplexed by the trials and sufferings they had to face. We do not wonder. Ever since then the large amount of human suffering in life has been the chief cause of perplexity and doubt. 'How can there be a good God in the universe, when this world is a torture chamber for millions?' How many thousands have said that with a groan!

To begin with we all want life to be a pleasant and happy thing, and we expect it to be. We even feel it *ought* to be. We all have a large appetite for pleasure. And then very soon the shocks begin. The physical sufferings of many children are intense, and their emotional sufferings are far more acute than most of us grown-up people remember or realize. Then adolescence for a great many young men and women contains days of strangely acute misery; and though we afterwards realize that we exaggerated our woes very foolishly, yet none the less they were very real at the time.

And then when we do actually embark on adult life, what a tough and strange thing it turns out to be! To a good many people physical delicacy and bodily pain are apportioned. To many more hardship and injustice. There are many rough, cruel, and unjust people still in the world, and their victims suffer acutely. And how our own mistakes cost us dear!

Then the affairs of the heart cause such deep-seated and searching agonies. They go wrong. They flourish and then wither. Our power to love is the divinest thing in us, and yet it seems to be linked up with terrible openness to agony. If we could see the scars on the personalities of our contemporaries, the deepest would prove to have been made by pains of the heart.

And who shall ever weigh the pains that come from sheer starvation of the heart! To have great power to love, and then to find that our love is not wanted—to love and watch another's love die away—these are fiery trials which have never been fully described. Only the victims understand.

Finally what hopeless victims we all seem to be of social and political confusion! Probably a majority of the Christians to whom Peter wrote suffered fiery trials because of the cruelties of the Roman Empire. It was an age when the power of the sword was used ruthlessly—when slavery existed on an immense scale—when the weak were victimized in a thousand ways, and when insensate religious persecution was apt to break out at any time.

In a measure it has been so ever since. At this moment there are millions of prematurely bereaved people in Europe, because the insanity of war has come to curse us. There are many victims of poverty and unemployment. These are all the results of our social confusions and corporate sins. And all the time the individuals who suffer are for the most part innocent.

Apart from all that what strange blows death deals—not the kindly death that comes to give people rest after long careers, but premature and cruel death that crashes in on unfinished lives.

And yet Peter says 'Think it not strange concerning your fiery trials.' But that is exactly what we do think. They seem to us very, very strange—maddeningly strange. We have known people who because of these things lost their religion, 'What nonsense,' they have said, 'it is to talk about a good God, who also has power, in view of the actual facts about our world and our life'!

Sometimes the victims of suffering are heard to say 'What have I done to deserve such pain?' To that very often the answer is 'Nothing.' Jesus Himself was anxious to dispel the idea that suffering is always a form of punishment. 'But then,' many will cry, 'why does God send such suffering?' And the answer to that is that very often God *does not send it.* We are apt to blame God for man's follies and sins. We human beings carry the terrible responsibility of freedom, and we often misuse it, and so torment each other. A very large part of human suffering—we do not say all—is the result of the cruelties, follies, mistakes, and brutalities of human beings themselves.

But now we must come to the really great and central question. 'Why,' it may be asked, 'does God allow all this?' That is the essential question. No amount of thinking can provide for us an escape from the truth that God is ultimately responsible for a world in which pain plays a very large part.

We think it strange. Peter does not. We are apt to think that something must have gone wrong with the universe, because pain falls so cruelly here and there. A good deal of our suffering is ultimately to be traced to the terrible suspicion which crops up in our minds that we do not live in an ordered world but in a chaos wherein anything may happen however useless, senseless, or painful. But Peter was free from that horrible

dread. He was quite confident in spite of the fiery trials. And is it not the true explanation of that that he saw that *pain is part of the plan*? That is the arresting truth we have to face. We were born to enjoy, and thank God millions of us do enjoy in a measure far far beyond all our desert. But we were also born to suffer, so that very nearly all of us make an intimate acquaintance with pain. And the explanation of this *must* lie in the strange truth that pain and suffering are *not* the wholly bad things which we think they are. They are *very* unpleasant and hard to bear, but they are *not* such bad things as we think at first. They are *not* so inconsistent with some divine plan as we assumed they must be. It is true, that when taken wrongly, they simply paralyse and murder life. But, rightly taken, they have quite other and sometimes very beautiful results.

When I was a student in Edinburgh our hero and our most wonderful teacher in religion was that radiant spirit Henry Drummond. He was virile, handsome, healthy, gay, many-sided, strangely successful, and with it all a most lovable character. And at one stage he was heard to say in connection with suffering, 'I have never been called on to face it, and when I see what wonderful fruits it has, I feel that I would like to have my share of it.' And then it came to him. For two years he faced long, intense, acute physical pain. And to our wondering eyes it actually did turn out that he was made even yet more beautiful, and more Christlike. The way he bore that pain was the greatest triumph of his life.

Have we not all seen such things happening? It was said even of Christ that He was made perfect through suffering.

There is a very curious fact that calls for notice here. Many people are far more perplexed and perturbed by the sufferings of others than by their own. And surely that is because in our own cases we are able to see that it was good for us to be disciplined. Looking back would we, even if we could, cut out the times when we simply had to endure as best we could? We did not like it at the time, for 'no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous. Nevertheless afterward it yieldeth its peaceable fruits.' If we have any firm self-control, any reliable courage, any tried patience, any inner strength, are not these the fruits of the hard times we have lived through?

Look at the matter for a moment from the opposite end. Have we not known people for whom life has been disastrously easy. They have had health, and inherited financial ease. They have had husbands or wives to spoil them. They have enjoyed all the amenities, and have had no outward anxieties. And have we not felt that what they really need in order to become real men or women is just some experience of failure, pain, struggle and endurance.

Yet I have a caution to utter. I have known people watch the sufferings and privations of the poor and the sick, and say 'It is all right. Pain produces good results.' And so they have done nothing about it. There are no words suitable for use in the pulpit to describe the inhumanity and the callousness of that attitude. It is wholly and utterly unchristian. Though Jesus knew all there is to know about suffering, and though, let us note, He retained undimmed His faith in the love of God, yet His response to suffering was always to go immediately to the help of sufferers. To Him pain in others was always a challenge. All the modern efforts of many kinds to remove the causes of suffering and to ease the pains of its victims are wholly and entirely Christian.

It is a pity when we so live that either we do not know or can forget the millions who are in pain. If we could carry out a dream we have probably had, and could go and live in comfort in some lovely spot in the country to which no dirt or noise can penetrate, and where we would not even need to read the papers, it would be a great pity. We *ought* to let our hearts be torn by the groaning and the travail of mankind.

And now let us think of one blessed fact. There is a certain very intimate, and very beautiful fellowship with God which is the peculiar privilege of sufferers. It is a sacrament which they alone partake of with Him. They get nearer to Him than any others. They come to know wonderful things about how He can give inner comfort, light, and peace.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Humility.

BY DR. A. MAUDE ROYDEN, SEVENOAKS, KENT.

'God . . . giveth grace unto the humble.—Ja 4^6.

Humility is one of the most lovable of virtues, and has the worst reputation. Even meekness is not more generally execrated, or more commonly misunderstood. With humility, the misunderstanding is no doubt due in part to the mischievous influence of Dickens: the adorable virtue has been and for some generations must remain tarred with

the odious brush of Uriah Heap. If there could be any consolation in the dimming of Dickens' fame (but I think there cannot) it would be that with the disappearance of David Copperfield into oblivion would go the identification of ''umbleness' with the detestable Uriah.

Yet, even so, it appears to be difficult for most Christians to love humility. Pride is so engrained in our hearts that we, even unconsciously, associate humility with falseness, and therefore detest it. Indeed, if it is false, it is detestable and more so than other assumed virtues, or even than some unassumed vices. It requires sincerity beyond everything, and only when it is entirely free from the touch of insincerity is it endurable. Honest and unblushing pride is far less odious.

What is humility? How shall we make it our own?

God makes us in His image and Jesus Christ required us to be perfect 'even as your Father in heaven is perfect.' He repeatedly set before us this incredibly and inspiringly glorious goal.

'Blessed are the peacemakers: *for they shall be called the children of God.*' 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; *that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven*: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' 'For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you.'

But if to become godlike is our inspiration and our goal, what shall we say of humility? Can such a virtue be found in Deity? And if not, should we find it in ourselves?

It is a Christian virtue. Aristotle despised it. Even Spenser did not include it among the seven virtues whose practice he demanded from the Christian knight, and I doubt whether, if he had finished the roll of twelve which he promised us, humility would have made one: 'courtesie' was as near as he would go. Humility might be commendable in a woman or a slave, but hardly in a knight. Yet even an Elizabethan could associate it with our Master Christ who was, in his eyes,

> A soft meek patient humble tranquil spirit,
> The first true gentleman that ever breathed.

There is a certain naïve snobbery in the 'humility' which Christian thought has associated with Jesus of Nazareth. Mediæval writers are earnest in their assurances that He was of the blood royal and that His mother 'bore arms,' or had a right to: and even to-day one finds the virtue of humility cited in connexion with His signal condescension in being born a carpenter! That has always struck me as being exceedingly comic. As if, in the sight of the Lord of Lords and King of Kings, the Ancient of Days, Almighty, Everlasting, the social distinctions, which in our myopic eyes, distinguish the king from the carpenter had any reality! But humility does co-exist with Deity, if one gets away from the idea that it is merely the Christian (and therefore commendable) form of an inferiority complex.

Nothing is more unattractive than this. It is a relief and an enlightenment to many of us that psychologists have brought it to the surface of our consciousness and helped us to be rid of it. It is in the nature of things heavily disguised. One of the commonest of its disguises is humility; and the most successful. Most people now are able to recognize in the bumptious arrogance of the down-trodden, the physically or intellectually handicapped, the consciously inferior, a natural reaction against an intolerable sense of inferiority: but the submissive, self-obliterating and apparently genuine *acceptance* of the inferiority, which is vanity's other disguise, is often not recognized at all and even—in theory—admired. This is perhaps why it is so exasperating. One feels that humility *ought* to be admired, and the fact that, instead, one is repelled by it, fastens the guilt on oneself, with infuriating results.

Such 'humility' is generally accompanied by other grave inconveniences. The 'humble' person will not undertake a job of work because he fears he cannot do it well: really because he is too conceited to risk failure. He will not risk playing a part for which an actor is required because he is too vain to risk making a fool of himself. The rôle of the humble, self-effacing person is almost equally decorative and involves no risk at all. If people do not appreciate his humility at its proper value that surely is their fault, not his!

But this is not humility at all; it is conceit heavily disguised, and disguise of any kind is incompatible with humility. It may almost be said to consist in a complete absence of disguise for, in fact, it does consist in an absence of self-consciousness which is the most sincere thing in the world. It is spontaneous, it is 'natural,' before all things. This is why it is so lovable.

I think one of the best instances of such humility was supplied by a much-loved professor on the faculty of a great university. He was about to retire from work, and, on the occasion of his last

lecture, his students began to sing, as he left the platform—'He's a jolly good fellow.' It happened that they sang it rather badly and the professor, who was something of a musician, was exasperated by the performance. He turned back, remounted the platform, and conducted the singing in good time. When it ended, and the cheers that followed it had died away, he was heard to ask for whom the song had been sung? And it is believed that to this day he does not know, as the person questioned was too stupefied to reply.

This is humility. It is not an attitude of mind laboriously won by long cogitation on one's shortcomings and sins. It does not arise from a comparison of oneself with one's neighbours or competitors. It is not expressed in deprecating words or in a refusal to accept responsibility because responsibility involves some degree of limelight. The humble guest takes the lowest place, not because he considers his claim to a higher one inferior to those of other guests, but because he sees their claims so clearly that he has not thought about his own at all.

I remember walking into a crowded hall with Dr. Philip Wicksteed on an occasion on which he was a very considerable figure indeed. His face was as well-known to the doorkeeper as that of the sun or the moon. It happened, however, that this official was turning back some 'gate-crasher' who had arrived without a ticket and, before he saw who Dr. Wicksteed was, he held out his hand for his ticket too. In a moment he realized to whom he was speaking and earnestly apologized for such a *gaffe*. Dr Wicksteed, however, unconscious of offence, was carefully searching every pocket for his ticket, produced it at last with every appearance of relief, and said to me, as we passed through, that it was lucky indeed that he had not left it carelessly at home.

Humility which proceeds from such a complete absence of self-consciousness is a quality most lovable and most rare. It is easy to find it in company with what seems like an assertion of rights. Our Lord was not less 'a humble tranquil spirit' because He rebuked the Pharisee who was discourteous to Him. 'My head with oil thou didst not anoint.' Such an act was discourteous: that it was discourtesy to Him made it no worse and no better. It could therefore be pointed out without any self-consciousness or acrimony, and it was.

Since Almighty Power and Love cannot be insincere, cannot be affronted, cannot have a sense of inferiority, humility can be found therein and found supremely. How strange it sounds! For there is still in our un-Christian ears a connexion between the inferior and the humble. Yet how often that sublime and heavenly humility is with us and we are moved to worship it. It is expressed in the familiar accents of that homely hymn:

> Knocking, knocking, who is there?
> Waiting, waiting, oh, how fair!
> 'Tis a Pilgrim, strange and kingly,
> Never such was seen before;
> Ah, my soul, for such a wonder,
> Wilt thou not undo the door?

It sounds in more majestic words—yet not less humble:

'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me.' (Rev 3^{20}).

Is there anything more worshipful in God Himself than this? This, which is not an unreal or laboured conviction of one's own unworthiness—meaningless in the thought of Deity—but a reverence most great, most unexpected, most, one had almost said, *unnecessary*, for the personality of another, though that other be so small and slight a thing as man. Can anything in the Godhead more compel to worship?

Such is humility.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

LIKE most dictionaries, the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*[1] varies in quality. The latest issues contain some smaller articles which are slight, as, for example, those on Schleiermacher, and Service in War. The latter notes, by the way, that 'if the Church at the opening of the middle ages reverted to the ancient rule which prescribed all shedding of blood, it was in order to put an effective check on the brutality of the German peoples with their strong inclinction to acts of violence and murder' (p. 1980). Three longer articles, however, are important. The survey of Scholasticism (1691–1728) by G. Fritz and A. Michel not only covers Eastern as well as Western thought but ends with a few paragraphs on neo-scholasticism outside as well as inside the Roman communion. Scholasticism is defined as 'essentially a method of theological and philosophical speculation which contemplates the rational analysis and systematization of revealed truths, by aid of philosophical concepts.' In a learned and distinguished article on Satisfaction (pp. 1130–1210) P. Galtier discusses the subject at full length in connexion with penance, as a sequel and supplement to the article on Penitence; the discussion is historical but also critical of current views since the Council of Trent. In particular, the outline of mediæval indulgences is illuminating. The third significant article is on Schism. The introductory section by M. J. Congar (pp. 1286–1312) is less interesting than the elaborate study of the rupture between the Greek and the Latin churches (pp. 1312–1468), in which M. Jugie contrives to present the Latin point of view with skill. The shorter account of the ugly papal schism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (1468–1492) by E. Vansteenberghe is descriptive rather than profound, but Jugie's essay clears up some of the ramifications of the issue.

A further instalment (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1938) of Karl Müller's manual of Church history[2] covers the policy of Constantine, the rise of movements like Manicheeism and Donatism, Asceticism and Monasticism, with some account of popular religion in the fourth century. The bibliographical data are brought up to date, and the revision maintains the balance between new material and a regard for brevity. The edition is a welcome lease of new life for what is the most compact and reliable outline of the subject for German students. The style is plodding, but the matter is well arranged.

Paul Humbert's article on the fault of Adam, in the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (xxvii. 225–240) anticipates what he proposes to argue in a forthcoming critical volume on the Story of Paradise and the Fall in Genesis. He refuses to see in Gn 2^4-3^{24} anything but extracts worked up into a literary unity by the Yahvist, and agrees with those who take the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to mean experimental knowledge, not the knowledge of sex, nor reason, nor moral consciousness. 'Good and evil' are fundamentally whatever exists. Man was created innocent and ignorant, like a child who ought to obey his father without asking questions. The Yahvist's religious interpretation is that Adam's fault was not a moral error but a lack of faith. Adam did not obey God's authority. He was guilty of proud self-exaltation, of a breach with the normal acceptance of that revealed will of God which meant him to depend on God alone. The temptation of the serpent was to make Adam a god to himself. And the punishment was death, for man was created 'earthy,' liable to mortality; but mortality depended on his conduct towards God. Death became therefore the indirect consequence of his proud self-exultation which proved fatal to him and his race. Not that God promised immortality, for immortality or life eternal is a divine mystery, a gift of free grace. Still, the point of the Genesis story, it is argued, is that man's ideal state was a childlike trust in God, to which blessing was attached. To remain within God's order, as to enter it, the childlike spirit is essential. Any proud effort to be equal to God is tragic and disastrous. The story of the Fall is the first illustration of what the Yahvist brings out later in the murder of Abel, the monstrous union of God's sons with women, the sin of Ham, and the tower of Babel. Whenever man seeks to exalt himself, instead of being content to trust God humbly, the result is a rupture

[1] Fascicules cxxviii.–cxxxi (Libraire Letouzey et Ane, Paris).

[2] *Kirchengeschichte*, von Karl Müller, Erster Band, erster Halbband, Dritte Auflage, neu überarbeitete in Gemeinschaft mit Frh. Hans von Campenhausem, Zweite Lieferung (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1940).

of humanity, whose true position is one of absolute confidence in the supreme will of God.

The latest issue of the crisp, scholarly *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*,[1] to which attention has been already called in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October 1937) is devoted to the five Megilloth. Dr. Kurt Galling edits Ecclesiastes, in which he finds some orthodox additions by way of correction, and also pieces from another hand (like 12^{9-11} and 12^{12-14}) than that of the author, but declines to deny a certain unity. The identification of the author with Solomon, in the opening chapters, is a piece of literary fiction derived from Egypt, where wisdom-speculations were regarded as royal revelations; but the locality of the book is sought in Palestine. It is more likely that it was written in the third than in the fourth century B.C. The bibliography is well selected but it omits Dr. A. B. Davidson's short, penetrating article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. The other four books are edited by Dr. Max Haller. He refuses to find any distinct motive in Ruth, though the addition in $4^{11f.}$ links it to the Davidic line. It is simply a charming idyll of pious peasant life, showing how the Lord cares for His own; perhaps there is a mythological background, but the tale speaks for itself, and Naomi is really more prominent than Ruth, although the latter's deference to old age is one mark of the religious ideal. Canticles is linked to the Mazzoth festival, being a collection of secular love-songs originally earlier than the Exile perhaps, and connected with myths of a Nature-festival. They are located in northern Israel. The elegies collected in Lamentations reflect the experience of some who had been eye-witnesses of the tragedies at Jerusalem in 597 or 586; the acrostic form varies, but in any case it reflects the ancient belief in the magical significance of the alphabet, though for the writers it is a literary convention. The editor renders the last verse, 'Or hast thou utterly rejected us, and art very wroth against us?' It is superfluous for the synagogue to repeat the previous verse, as though the poem ended in pessimism. In reality the poet puts a pleading question which implies that such an idea is impossible. 'Here, as in every prayer, hope has the last word.' The novelist who wrote Esther was not accurately informed about some of the Persian customs which colour his narrative as he accounts for the Purim festival. The story represents a Hebrew adaptation of what was originally an Elamite Nature-myth. It shows a 'blind hatred of Gentiles,' and at the same time celebrates the strong family feeling of the Jews, their astuteness, and the folly of any pagan power, corporate or individual, daring to attack them. Dr. Haller's notes, specially on Canticles and Lamentations, are as excellent and stimulating as Dr. Galling's on Ecclesiastes, though the latter has naturally more opportunity for rousing human interest and literary enjoyment.

[1] *Die Fünf Megilloth* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1940; RM.6).

In the *Revue Biblique* (xlviii. 506–529) R. P. Dubarle spins a hypothesis about the Epistle to the Hebrews which is certainly novel. He infers from some verbal resemblances between it and the Epistle of Jude that the latter writer worked up some notes or a rough draft prepared by the Apostle Paul into what we now read as Hebrews, which probably was addressed to some Asiatic Christians who were liable to be seduced by the Jewish Law. Indeed, the author of this essay thinks that Hebrews and First Peter on the one hand and Jude with Second Peter on the other are connected, though we can only guess vaguely at the circumstances. 'All four epistles were started by the same crisis in Asia Minor' (p. 527). Paul could not leave Rome to deal with the situation on the spot; he had only time to outline a homily on the subject, which Jude edited, and which Peter himself followed up with a couple of letters.

The meaning of Jn 1^{43} is discussed by Paul Jouon in *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (xxix. 620f.). 'The day following he would (or, was minded) to go into Galilee, and he findeth Philip.' The verb ἠθέλησεν is commonly rendered either by 'he chose (or determined)' or by 'he desired,' though the latter (retained in the Vulgate 'voluit') gives a flat sense. But, as θέλω is elsewhere used in the sense not only of 'would' but perhaps of 'was on the point of' (Mk 6^{48} ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν), the author proposes to translate it here, 'he was on the point of going into Galilee when he met Philip.' This at first sight looks attractive. But it would imply that Jesus did not meet Philip in his own district of Galilee. Now Jesus did enter Galilee, since the Cana wedding (2^{1}) takes place there, and on M. Jouon's theory there is no mention of any actual visit to Galilee which would lead up to Jesus being in the vicinity of the wedding. Besides, with all respect to M. Jouon, θέλω in Hellenistic Greek did carry the sense of 'choose' or 'determine,' as Dr. E. A. Abbott incidentally shows in his *Johannine Grammar* (p. 2471).

New York. JAMES MOFFATT.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark xii. 35–37 and the Pre-Existence of Jesus in Mark.

Some scholars affirm that the Second Gospel shows no trace of the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus, whereas others allow that Mark implies it in his narrative. In addition to the suggestion of the pre-existence of the Christ contained in the use of such titles as Lord, Son of God, and Son of Man, the following passages are often mentioned as significant; 1^{11} (especially εὐδόκησα); 1^{38} (ἐξῆλθον);[1] 1^{10} (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς); 13^{32} (the Son has rank above the angels); and then such scenes as the baptism, the temptation, and the transfiguration[2] in which Jesus may be seen as owned and ministered to by the heavenly world from which He came.

But how far is the importance of 12^{35-37} fully realized in this connexion? Origen, in commenting on these words in their Matthean setting,[3] certainly understood them as alluding to Christ's pre-existence, but was he at one in this respect with the mind of Mark?

Since Mark and the other Synoptic writers clearly accept the Davidic sonship of Jesus (Mk $10^{47f.}$ 11^{10}) the main purpose of Mk 12^{35-37} is not a repudiation of that theory; but, as E. Lohmeyer[4] contends, Ps 110^1 is here quoted to show that the Son of David must be understood as something more than an earthly prince. He is also transcendental Lord, or Son of Man. The apparent antithesis between being David's Lord and David's son can only be resolved in that way. That in Mk 14^{62} use is again made of Ps 110^1 and this time in association with specifically Son of Man Christology supports this view. But if for the evangelist Ps 110^1 has relation to Son of Man Christology, it may also bear some allusion to the conception of the pre-existence of the Son of Man held by the apostolic Church.

Another preliminary point is the content of Ps 110^1 itself, especially in its LXX (Ps 109) form from which Mark quotes. The Psalm could be taken to affirm the pre-existence of David's Lord even in the Massoretic text, through the reference to Melchizedek in v.[4]; but, in the LXX version, a change has been made in v.[3] which strengthens the reference to pre-existence considerably: ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε. When v.[1] was quoted from so short a Psalm, would it not have carried some recollection of its original context with it?

But now we come to the main points of our case. Writing of Mk 12^{35-37}, James Mackinnon says, 'The allusion to his sitting on the right hand of God seems to point to his future transcendental state, not to a pre-temporal existence. He is the Messianic Lord whom David foresaw.'[5] But why should Mark have thought that David only 'foresaw' the Lord of whom he speaks? The Greek of Ps 110^1 left him free to believe that David was actually aware of the Messianic κύριος as one then existent in heaven at the time of the writing of the Psalm. Is it probable that Mark did so construe the verse?

The Gospel of Mark came out of a Church which had long believed in the pre-existence of Christ. From 1 Corinthians onwards, the Pauline letters clearly attest this doctrine; and Hebrews, and the Johannine literature give further evidence of its prominence. Even before Abraham was, before all creation in fact, the Church's Lord was said to have lived in heaven with God. From such a conviction, it was a small step indeed to the idea that this pre-existent Christ had had actual contact with Abraham, Moses, David, and other Old Testament characters in their successive generations. Judaism, too, had been speculating about the pre-existent Logos or Wisdom, in just such a way. Pre-existent Wisdom had functioned as the friend and guide of men from Adam to Moses; or by Solomon she was prized, known, and possessed as companion.[6] Philo's Logos was present to Old Testament men and women. It could be identified with the angel of Ex 23^{20}, and said to superintend all creatures whether mortal or divine; or it was the angel which appeared to Hagar,[7] etc. If Judaism had been claiming so much for the pre-existent agencies of God's activity in the world, would not the Church have been encouraged to speculate on the pre-incarnation activity of the heavenly Christ in a similar way?

That the sub-apostolic writers did so develop

[1] See especially the comment on this verse by E. Lohmeyer in *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1937), 43.

[2] Cf. J. B. Barnardin, 'The Transfiguration' in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lii. (1933), 181–189.

[3] *Commentary on Matthew*, Latin 5. See Harold Smith, *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels*, v. 61.

[4] *Op. cit.* 261 f.

[5] *The Historic Jesus*, 378.

[6] 'Wisdom of Solomon.' See especially chs. 8, 9, 10.

[7] Cohn u. Wendland, *Philonis Opera*, ii. p. 106, 51; p. 302, 174; iii. p. 111, 5.

the pre-existent Christology is perfectly clear. Melito of Sardis described Jesus as one 'who was pilot to Noah, who conducted Abraham, who was bound with Isaac, who was in exile with Jacob, who was sold with Joseph, . . . who in David and the prophets foretold his own sufferings. . . .'[1] An excellent example of similar thought appears earlier in Justin Martyr. It was Christ, he says, who appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, who shut Noah in the ark, spake to Moses and other Old Testament figures, for 'you must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place' (127). 'Therefore neither Abraham nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all . . . but (saw) Him who was according to His will His Son' (127). Justin then goes on to mention that it was the same Son whom David called Lord in Ps 110^1, and without any doubt Justin thinks of David as aware of the existence of Christ just as Abraham and the others were.[2] As Rendel Harris has said: 'The identification of the historical Jesus with Old Testament situations appears to have been a commonplace with a school of primitive exegetes.'[3] As pre-existent, Christ did not live in remote passivity in heaven, but was actively present to men of old, and they were conscious of His help.

Did the New Testament writers themselves share this conception? There is evidence that they did. 1 Co 10^4 reflects it. Christ was with 'our fathers' in their wilderness journeying, and so could be the rock from which they drank. Some MSS. (D G, etc. etc.) also read in v.[9] that they tempted Χριστόν which though possibly an interpretative reading may none the less be a perfectly legitimate understanding of κύριος. Again in 1 P 1^{11} it was the Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament Prophets which revealed to them Christ's future sufferings; and because Christ was with Moses in Egypt, Moses could be said quite literally to have accepted the ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (He 11^{26}). Why further should the Revised Version want to read Ἰησοῦς = 'Joshua' in He 4^8? A writer holding the pre-existence of Jesus as strongly as the author of Hebrews did could have understood Ἰησοῦς = 'Jesus' quite naturally, and this obviates the necessity of assuming θεός as understood in the text after κατέπαυσεν as Moffatt does (*ICC*). It was the active, pre-existent Jesus who had not given the Children of Israel rest, who spoke of another day of rest, and it was He therefore who also spoke in David, according to 4^7. Then in Jude 5, there is excellent MS. evidence (A B 33, etc.) for reading Ἰησοῦς (which Souter prefers), and so making Jesus the one who saved Israel from Egypt. Finally, Jn 8^{56-58} is perhaps noteworthy. Burney (*ICC*) regards καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακέ σε as the true reading of 8^{57}; but whether we accept that, or Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας, it may be significant that Jesus does not deny the possibility put forward in the question of the Jews. His correction implies not that they suggest too much, but too little—even 'before Abraham was, I am.'

It appears that the New Testament writers shared the view of the sub-apostolic age that Jesus as pre-existent, heavenly Man lived in no distant detachment from life on earth, but had personal contact with men in this world. It will therefore be reasonable to suppose that this idea existed in Mark's mind when he wrote 12^{35-37} into his Gospel. If so, then Mark believed that David did not merely foresee his Messianic Lord, but had knowledge of Him as then in heaven with God, one to whom God had already vouchsafed the place at His right hand. So understood the words of the quotation read less akwardly, and certainly imply the pre-existence of Christ.

G. H. Boobyer.

Selly Oak, Birmingham.

[1] W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 53.

[2] *Dial c. Try.*, 126–129. See also *Apol.* i. 63; *Ep. of Barnabas*, v. 6, 11; xii. 11; Cyprian, *Testimonies*, ii. 5; Origen, *Possinus' Catena* (Smith, *Ante-Nic. Exeg. of Gospels*), iii. 192.

[3] *Testimonies*, ii. 57. See the whole chapter, 'Jesus and the Exodus,' 51 ff.

A Peculiar Reading of Colossians ii. 5.

On reading recently Augustine's treatise entitled 'A Reply to Faustus, the Manichaean,' my attention was arrested by a very peculiar reading of Col 2^5, which occurs in the first of the thirty-three books. It will be best to give the passage as it stands:

> 'Augustinus respondit: Tu semichristianos cavendos putas, quod nos esse dicis: nos autem pseudochristianos cavemus, quod vos esse ostendimus. Nam quod semis est, ex quadam parte imperfectum, ex nulla tamen falsum est. Quid ergo? Si aliquid deest fidei eorum quos circumvenire conamini, numquid ideo id quod eis adest destruendum, ac non potius id quod deest astruendum est? Sicut ad quosdam imperfectos loquens Apostolus ait: *Gaudens et videns*

vestram conversationem, et id quod deest fidei vestrae in Christo (Col 2^5). Cernebat utique quamdam fabricam spiritualem, sicut alibi dicit, *Dei aedificatio estis*: et in ea cernebat utrumque: et unde gauderet et unde satagaret. Gaudebat ex eo quod aedificatum videbat; satagebat eo quod usque ad culmen perfectionis adhuc aedificandum esse sentiebat.'

This may be freely rendered:

'You warn us against Semi-Christians, which you say we are; but we warn against Pseudo-Christians, which we have shown you to be. Semi-Christianity may be imperfect. What then? If the faith of those you try to mislead is imperfect, would it not be better to supply what is lacking than to rob them of what they have? Even as it was to imperfect Christians that the Apostle wrote: *Joying and beholding your conversation and the deficiency of your faith in Christ* (Col 2^5). The Apostle had in view a spiritual structure, as he says elsewhere: *Ye are God's building*; and in this structure he found both a reason for joy, and a reason for exertion; he rejoiced to see part already finished, and the necessity of bringing the edifice to perfection called for exertion.'

The fact that Augustine was driven to such a strained exegesis, suggests that he was entirely satisfied with the correctness of the text in front of him.

The Treatise is dated 400 B.C., and though Jerome seems to have completed his Vulgate New Testament in 385, a study of the abundant quotations from the New Testament which are embedded in Augustine's 'Reply to Faustus' indicate that he was still using the Old Latin Version.

The explanation of this Old Latin reading is not, I believe, far to seek. A Greek scribe had evidently misread ΤΟΣΤΕΡΕΩΜΑ as ΤΟΥΣΤΕΡΗΜΑ, and it is interesting to note that the Old Latin of D (Codex Claramontanus) has another rendering of the same mistake: *id quod deest necessitatibus*; showing that the error was current elsewhere, though no Greek MS. now existing contains it.

Since writing the above my attention has been called to the fact that T. K. Abbott notes this Greek reading as inferred from d and e, 'Quod deest necessitatibus fidei vestrae,' and accounts for it in the same way. (See Ephesians and Colossians in *ICC*, p. 244), giving two other references in Augustine for it. One is in Joh. Tract. 98 (written A.D. 416), where, after quoting Col 2^5 in this form, he further cites 1 Th 3^{10}, 'et suppleamus quae desunt fidei vestrae,' suggesting the idea that the defects in his readers were, as it were, providential, as affording him pleasure in supplementing them; cf. Ro $1^{11.\ 12}$. The other reference by Abbott is Epis. 149; but, owing to the confusion in the numbering of the Letters, I cannot locate this in the Benedictine Edition.

FRANK ANDERSON.
Huron College,
London, Ontario, Canada.

The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom ii. 24.

(*φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.*)

MOST commentators, including Goodrick,[1] Deane,[2] Holmes,[3] and Harris,[4] have seen in this verse an identification of the Devil with the serpent of the Fall Story. This is most important, being the first occasion in extant literature on which the two are equated, unless the reference in the Slavonic Enoch is regarded as being earlier. In Apocalyptic literature of a later date this identification is frequent (*vide* Rev 12^9).

But the correctness of this exegesis may be questioned. It is *death* which 'enters into the world'; it is not *evil*, as would be expected if we had here a reference to the Fall Story. Again, so far as Gn 3 is concerned, we are not told that the serpent was envious. It was considerations such as these which led Gregg[5] to abandon any Fall Story interpretation, and to assert that the reference is to the murder of Abel by Cain.

This is a perfectly tenable explanation, for, according to Genesis, this murder was the first appearance of death in human history. There is, however, the difficulty that, in Genesis, no mention is made of the 'envy of the devil,' but Gregg attempts to surmount this by drawing attention to the fact that Theophilus (*ad Autol.*, II, 29) says that Satan was jealous of Abel, when he saw that he was pleasing to God, and therefore prompted Cain to kill him. A somewhat similar explanation is to be found in Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.*, III).

Commentators, however, have not stressed that the English Version is hardly correct—'But by envy of *the* devil death entered into the world.' Yet in the Greek text no definite article is to be

[1] *The Book of Wisdom* (Rivington).
[2] *The Book of Wisdom* (Oxford).
[3] Art. 'Wisdom' in *Apocrypha* (ed. Charles).
[4] Art. 'Wisdom' in *New Commentary* (S.P.C.K.).
[5] *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Camb. Bible).

found with the word 'devil.' Another, and perhaps more accurate, translation would be: 'But by envy of *an adversary* death entered into the world.' No longer is any explanation needed to justify the reference to the Devil, for διαβόλου is taken as referring to Cain himself. He, it cannot be denied, was Abel's adversary: and his sin was caused by envy.

It may be objected that the true meaning of διάβολος is 'slanderer.' This objection does not hold good so far as the LXX Greek is concerned. The Hebrew word SATAN (שָׂטָן) is often used in the Old Testament of an adversary, either earthly or angelic; and here the LXX generally has διάβολος, or some periphrasis employing the word διαβολή. And in 1 Macc 1^{36} (καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ παντός) the word can be used of a definite locality.

The absence of the definite article has been passed over by most commentators, but Goodrick quotes Ac 13^{10} (υἱὲ διαβόλου) as another example of this omission. Against this it may well be asked whether Paul was referring here to *the* Devil, or to *a* devil or a slanderer. In the New Testament, when meaning the supreme power of evil, the word generally has the definite article. The same may be said of SATAN (שָׂטָן) in the Old Testament; the sole exception being 1 Ch 21^{1}, and even here there is a considerable amount of doubt as to whether Satan or an earthly adversary is indicated.

If this suggested translation and this interpretation are accepted, we have yet another example of that peculiar mannerism of Pseudo-Solomon which causes him to avoid the mention of proper names.

W. H. A. LEAROYD.

St. John's College, Durham.

ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυειδ παιδός σου εἰπών ΙΝΑ ΤΙ Κ.Τ.Λ.—Acts iv. 25.

THOUGH this is the oldest extant text, supported by B, ℵ, A, and others, few persons perhaps believe that, if St. Luke wrote it at all, it is what he meant to write. We are told that all the variants are attempts to set this chaos right—*i.e.*, that the scribes had this text and tried by various alterations to produce grammar and sense. In modern days Hort seems to have considered that τοῖς πατράσιν for τοῦ πατρὸς would remove all difficulty. Torrey ingeniously supposed a mistranslated Aramaic original, but who did he convince? For how could a writer like St. Luke possibly admit such a sentence as the mistranslation, *ex hypothesi*, produced?

Whatever the true explanation may be, it is curious that the words as we have them contain traces of three or more alternative ways of writing the sentence, any one of which could introduce the quotation ΙΝΑ ΤΙ Κ.Τ.Λ. Thus:

1. ὁ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰπών
2. ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυειδ [τοῦ] παιδός σου εἰπών
3. ὁ διὰ στόματος τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυειδ εἰπών.

Several places in the Acts suggest that the writer made more than one draft of his book, and that these drafts were far from coinciding verbally. Sometimes he re-wrote his sentences; sometimes, without re-writing, he may have made alterations, adding, subtracting, etc. This verse looks like a case in point. He wrote a first draft and then made corrections. Perhaps something like this—the bottom line being what he wrote first, and the others tentative alterations:

[1] τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
στόματος Δαυειδ παιδός σου
ὁ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰπών

He knew his own marks for deletion or addition, but one of the earliest copyists misunderstood them, combined words which were really alternative, and thereby sowed the seed of confusion for all time. Some such theory as this is perhaps both simpler and less unlikely than those generally put forward.

H. W. MOULE.

Damerham Vicarage,
Fordingbridge, Hants.

The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

THE suggestion made by Mr. L. G. Buckingham in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1939, p. 157f., that Paul's first and second visits to Jerusalem in *Acts* correspond respectively to his first and second visits in *Galatians*, although *Galatians* was not written until after the third visit (Ac 15), agrees with the view formerly expressed by Ramsay, *e.g.*, in the earlier editions of *St. Paul the Traveller*. The question why the Council is not mentioned in *Galatians* was thus dealt with by Ramsay (*SPT*, 187 f.):

[1] τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν applied to David seems odd; the oddness would disappear if Hort's τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν were read.

'The answer is obvious. He is engaged in proving that, when he gave his first message to the Churches of Galatia, he had never received any charge from the older Apostles. His whole point is: "Cleave to my first message, which came direct from God: if Silas and I afterwards said anything inconsistent with that message, we are accursed." The third visit to Jerusalem did not take place until after the Galatian Churches were founded, and therefore it could find no place in the autobiographical retrospect of 1^{12}–2^{10}; but it is clearly implied in the scornful and impetuous sentence, 1^{8}: "Even if Silas and I (as these emissaries have been telling you), if an angel from heaven, should preach to you a Gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, a curse be upon us."'

This position is definitely preferable to the theory that the second visit of *Acts* is omitted in *Galatians*. Ramsay, however, later found reason to change his mind about the date of *Galatians* and place it before the Council; see his prefatory essay to *SPT*[14] (1920), p. xxxi, and *The Teaching of Paul*, 372 ff.

This last position, supported by Burkitt, Professor Duncan (and at one time by Professor Lake), is probably the least beset with difficulties. The varied circumstances which called forth the epistles largely account for the differences in style, as they also determined the degree of eschatological emphasis. The situation which called forth Galatians had nothing to do with eschatology. Behind 1 Thessalonians, on the other hand, lies the question: 'What of believers who die before the Parousia?' This question certainly implies, what we already know, that Paul had given the Thessalonians some eschatological teaching; but, 'touching the Parousia,' he warns them in 2 Th 2 not to be misled into supposing that the Day of the Lord is imminent, so such imminence can scarcely have formed part of his teaching.

We may well doubt whether the eschatological interest in 1 and 2 Thessalonians is greater than that in 1 Co 15 (not to mention such later passages as Ph 3^{20}, Col 3^{4}, Tit 2^{13}). Indeed, 1 Co $15^{51ff.}$ is very similar to 1 Th $4^{15ff.}$ We need not press 'we' in 1 Th $4^{15.\,17}$, 1 Co $15^{51f.}$ and Ph 3^{20} to imply that Paul expected to be alive himself at the Parousia. 'We' is there general, as is 'us' in 2 Co 4^{14}, which might equally well be pressed to mean that Paul expected personally to share in the resurrection, and therefore to die first.

F. F. Bruce.

The University, Leeds.

The Feeding of the Four Thousand: Mark viii. 1–10.

It is generally supposed, from the similarity of symbolism and context, that this narrative is a 'doublet' of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Even Lagrange finds that 'the only serious argument that one may allege against the duality is the attitude of the apostles,' which he considers to be notably different in the second account.[1] Bultmann, however, regards this difference as indicative of the secondary nature of the story.

Assuming the single source of the two feedings it is yet necessary to find the reason for the double tradition. In the first account the disciples take up twelve basketfuls of fragments; in the second, seven basketfuls. The first number obviously corresponds to the twelve apostles; the second has been explained with reference to the seven loaves, but it seems better to accept the hint of Rawlinson's, 'is there a further correspondence with the seven deacons of Acts 6^{3}?'[2] This may give the clue to the problem of the perpetuation of the doublet.

It appears that the Hellenistic Jewish Christians early had their own meetings and organization. After the death of their leader Stephen, the Hellenists alone seem to have been dispersed from Jerusalem, to spread the gospel outside Judea and form communities soon to be partly non-Jewish (Ac 8^{1}). Of these Hellenists the seven 'deacons' are the chiefs, or at least the prototypes; perhaps with a certain symbolism in the universal figure seven. Loisy considers the choice of the deacons as subordinate officers to the apostles to be a fiction.[3] It is known that there were disputes about food between the Palestinians and the Hellenists (Ac 6^{2}), and probably on more than one occasion. No doubt part of these food disputes would concern the administration and the participation in the 'breaking of bread,' first with the Hellenistic Jews and later with uncircumcised Gentile converts (Gal 2^{12}). Already debate as to 'orders' and 'validity'! It is not difficult from this to see that the variant of the Feeding would be seized upon as justification for the sacramental meals of the Gentile Church. The variant would have arisen originally doubtless from different accounts as to the number of the loaves and the size of the crowd at the one historical event.

Corresponding to the sending out of the twelve apostles to the twelve tribes of Israel, the Gentiles

[1] *Evangile selon Saint Marc*, 204.
[2] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 104.
[3] *La Naissance du Christianisme*, 140–143.

have the mission of the seventy disciples to the seventy nations (Gn 10; see Creed on Lk 10[1]). The Jewish Christians obviously treasured the Five Thousand Feeding as a type of the Christian agapé; in John it is the only Eucharist. 'The evening hour, the people disposed in orderly eating companies (συμπόσια), as when Christians gathered for the love-feast. . . . the Twelve acting the part of deacons in the service and afterward in collecting the remnants (as we know was done at the Church observance),' all bring out the parallelism with the later ritual.[1] Similarly, the Hellenists and Gentiles would naturally take the variant of the Feeding as giving the origin of their sacred meal, and adapting the basketfuls to the number of their seven administrating deacons. Both Jew and Greek sought the authority of the Lord.

If the above suggestion is valid it must be admitted that the question in dispute is not made wholly clear in the Synoptics. Luke does not use the second feeding, and in omitting the whole section has been thought to act rather on critical grounds. Possibly the Gentile interpretation of the second feeding was unknown to Luke, or he may have omitted it in accordance with the principle, which he observes in the Acts, of toning down controversial matter. Mark places the first feeding, if not in Galilee, at least to a Jewish audience; but the Four Thousand are definitely fed in Decapolis, and therefore, by inference, to an audience largely composed of non-Jews, or people of mixed blood. Matthew has obscured this geographical move in order to keep Jesus within the bounds of Jewry. But it is not necessary to assert that even Mark wished to stress the definitely Gentile bearing of the doublet. It is likely that he incorporated the two versions because both had become well known and the duality was fixed; he may, indeed, have had two written sources before him. The double version was originally due to difference in the testimony of eye-witnesses; but the preservation of the second narrative was probably of considerable importance to a large section of the Christian community. But, after the early days, the principle for which they contended was accepted. The double reference, however, was still recognized in patristic exegesis which compared the five loaves of the Law given to the Jews, with the seven loaves of the Spirit given to the Gentiles.

Porto Novo, Dahomey, French West Africa. E. G. PARRINDER.

[1] B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus*, 152–153.

Entre Nous.

E. C. Bentley.

In *Those Days* (Constable; 12s. net) Mr. E. C. Bentley is concerned with the past—from the '80s to the last War. He avoids praise, for he is too good a journalist and man of letters not to know that praise of the past is boring. He tells us that he is concerned merely to tell about the past, but there is no doubt that for him 'those' days are better and happier than 'these' days.

'But if any one should declare his conviction that better times are coming, I should agree with him. It is a question of faith, without which nothing can be done: it is a necessity just as much as facing hard facts is a necessity, and neither of them is of any use without the other.'

Mr. E. C. Bentley was for years on the staff of the 'Daily News' and then on the 'Daily Telegraph' and so most of his writing has been anonymous. But, to readers of detective fiction, he has been known for a quarter of a century as the author of that early thriller, 'Trent's Last Case.' And when it is remembered that he is also the author of 'Biography For Beginners,' wherein originated those amusing verses, somewhat similar to limericks, his versatility will be appreciated. We expect *Those Days* to be eminently readable and so it is. His own account of the book, given in the Preface, is chapters strung together on a thread of personal experience, some parts of the book being plain autobiography, 'but these have been included as possessing (I hope) some interest of their own, apart from the subject of Me: they are stories in a book which consists very largely of stories.'

At Oxford, Bentley made many friends, in especial F. E. Smith, John Simon, Hilaire Belloc, and John Buchan. Of the latter he says, 'Buchan had a great affection for his friends; he did not care much for those who lacked that kind of feeling. "So-and-so has a heart like a dried pea," I remember him saying, "If you shook him you would hear it rattle".'

Frank Lenwood was at Oxford with him and was elected President of the Union. It was the custom that a newly-elected President should give a dinner to his Committee, with any other guests that he might choose—this naturally included ex-Presidents, who were in residence and this included F. E. Smith. Bentley tells a fine story of the courage which the

te Reverend Frank Lenwood showed, even in those rly days, in maintaining his principles.

rank Lenwood.

'When I was Librarian of the Society a president as elected—F. Lenwood—whose principles and ractice as regards alcoholic liquor were exactly pposed to those of F. E. Smith, whom Lenwood nvited to his dinner as a matter of course. When he invitations had gone out, I doubt if it occurred o any of the guests—it certainly did not to me—hat Lenwood's opinions would stand in the way of is deferring to custom in the matter of wine. However, when we were seated, with F. E. at the ew President's right hand as being the most minent of his predecessors then in residence (he was in fact a Fellow of my own college), our host rose and announced that he could not reconcile t with his conscience to offer his guests any intoxi-ating drink, and that he hoped they would not very much mind. I do not suppose that most of us did very much mind: to me, and doubtless to others, it was a declaration that compelled respect, considering what courage was needed to make it. Unfortunately, F. E. minded a great deal, and showed it. He turned his shoulder to his host throughout the dinner; and he called loudly and frequently for glasses of milk. I repeat that this action, done by a younger man who was entertaining F. E. as a distinguished guest, and who knew all about him, his opinions, his tastes, and his capacity for making himself unpleasant at need, showed moral courage of the highest order.'[1]

A Lion in the Garden.

G. B. Stern is at her light-hearted best in *A Lion in the Garden*. It is the story of typical old-fashioned servants and principally Norman Pascoe.

In Chapter One we are told how a trio of lions got loose from a travelling show and one came trotting towards Spinny Mead Lock; discovered that the gate of Norman's garden had been left swinging open and strolled up behind him 'where he was intent on clipping the privet hedge, and announced itself with pleasant purring noises.

'"Puss, puss," said Norman absently. "Pretty puss . . ."

'The purring went on, strangely loud.

'He turned and saw the lion.

'It was a large lion, and not behind bars.

'His description to the local paper said, at this point: "I did not stop to think, though it was as close as you are to me. I enviggled it into the kitchen and shut the door."'

[1] E. C. Bentley, *Those Days*.

This brief encounter with the lion, which happened twenty-five years before the other events in the story, gives the book its title and supplies the motif—courage. Telling the story to his friends and hearing their chorus: 'Well *done* old man! Couldn't have handled it better meself!' he has dreams of fine behaviour; of faithfulness, and especially of courage, to him the best of qualities.

Pascoe's second brave act is his espousal of the cause of Polly Brooks the housemaid. She chose to spend a legacy on 'high cockalorum'—a trip to the south of France. Pascoe speaks up for her at the risk of losing his job.

The third brave act alters the course of his future. He is now engaged to Gwennie, a pretty young maidservant, who is attracted to the insignificant Pascoe, because she believes that he not only 'knows *everything*' but also 'he can do everything too.' At this period, the family have a property on a small island and Norman is Houseman. Gwennie is entertaining her brother and sister-in-law, who have come to see her, bringing their little boy of four. They are proposing to leave him for a few hours with Norman, while they visit relatives. But Roysie is a venturesome little boy, who insists on playing on the edge of the island. '"He'll be all right with Norman," Gwennie reassured her. "Won't he, Norman?"'

'Fred Dyson said: "Mustn't make a ninny out of the boy. If Mr. Pascoe don't mind diving in and pulling him out of the water every few minutes——"

'"Not a bit," replied Norman, cheerful and obliging.

'Yet he turned his back on the little group, and walked to the prow end of the island, where he stood a while looking down into the rushes as though lost in thought.

'Presently he returned and said gently:

'"Better not risk it. You see, I can't swim."'

And so Norman loses Gwennie—however much of a loss this may be, for she was not the kind to understand when she saw him turn and come back to them across the lawn 'and heard him say in front of her, "I can't swim," that she was witnessing the third brave act of his life: an equivalent to the lion act, to the Mrs. Herrick act, but even more desperately courageous, done under the gaze of his beloved.'

Means of Grace.

Religion is a state and activity of the soul, and theology but a partial and blundering effort of the mind to explain it. The life of God in the heart of man is quite independent of any theories or explana-

tions of it that may be offered. It is of real importance that such theories and explanations should be true, but, true or false, they can never be a substitute for the life itself. Therefore to make a man's theology the criterion of his religion may be most misleading. It is notorious that men who are very jealous for the correctness of their theological opinions are often wholly irreligious, while some of the most truly devout and religious persons may be quite innocent of anything that can be called theology.

It is much the same with things ecclesiastical. A man is not made a Christian by joining a Church. Christ must be born in him first, and when that has happened his only concern about Churches will be to know which of them will help him best to nourish this divine life in the soul. . . . Let no man despise what are sometimes called the means of grace. Our church and chapel services, with all their crudities and imperfections, are for most people the only available means of coming into touch with the eternal and unseen, and so of cultivating the life of the soul. It is their task to keep religion alive in the land and to save us from the ruin that must overwhelm a godless nation in the end. It is a task in which all men and women of goodwill can help. By making the worship of our churches more devout and appealing and by maintaining in them a high standard of Christian character and witness, they can prove the power of religion and help to keep alive the soul of England. [1]

No Racial Boundaries.

After his death 'on Sunday morning 11th January 1931 the family of the great philanthropist, Nathan Straus, called me by telephone from New York, saying it was their unanimous request that I make the address at his public funeral.

'I took the train to New York and at the station entered a taxi to be taken to the beautiful Temple Emanu-El for the funeral exercises. When I gave that address to the taxi driver, he said, "Then you are going to the funeral of one of the best men who ever lived."

'Not many days before his death I had a remarkable conversation with Nathan Straus. He was on his deathbed and he knew it; yet as I bent close to his face, he whispered, "I am one of the happiest men in the world, for although I am weak and hopelessly ill, I know that I have done the right thing with my wealth, in giving so much of it away while I was alive and well. . . . John D. Rockefeller has been so wise in this respect. He is a man of the noblest and finest character. He has shown us all what to do with our wealth."

'He repeated to me one of his favourite quotations: "Money given in health is gold; money given in sickness is silver; money given at death is lead."

'Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Straus were devout and deeply religious Jews; their charity and love for mankind knew no racial or theological boundaries.' [2]

[1] W. B. Selbie in *The Christian World*, 18th April.

Modern Poetry.

In Mr. E. W. Parker's new anthology, *Modern Poetry* (Longmans; 2s. 6d.), there has been no attempt, he says, to make any well-balanced survey of modern poetry but rather to display its range and variety. This has been accomplished with success, though we doubt if Christina Rossetti, Hardy and Meredith can come under the category of 'modern' poets. We value them too much, however, to quarrel with their inclusion. The poets of to-day are many in number and several whose work we admire are not represented, but Mr. Parker's taste is sound and A. E. Housman, Victoria Sackville West, and Siegfried Sassoon are given a place. We find also 'The Tower' of Robert Nichols, omitted from too many anthologies, and T. S. Eliot's lovely 'Song of Simeon.'

Lord, the Roman hyacinths are blooming in bowls
and
The winter sun creeps by the snow hills; . . .
Grant us thy peace . . .
According to thy word.
They shall praise thee and suffer in every generation
With glory and derision,
Light upon light, mounting the saint's stair.
Not for me the martyrdom, the ecstasy of thought
and prayer,
Not for me the ultimate vision.
Grant me thy peace.
(And a sword shall pierce thy heart,
Thine also).
I am tired with my own life and the lives of those
after me,
I am dying in my own death and the deaths of those
after me.
Let thy servant depart,
Having seen thy salvation.

[2] William Lyon Phelps, *Autobiography with Letters*, 849.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.